

A N
E S S A Y
Towards Explaining the
Third Chapter of GENESIS,
AND THE
SPIRITUAL SENSE of the LAW.

In which

THE THIRD PROPOSITION of the DIVINE
LEGATION, and what the Author hath
brought to support it, are consider'd.

By JULIUS BATE, Rector of Sutton, in Suffex,
and Chaplain to the Right Honourable the Lord
Harrington, one of his Majesty's Principal Se-
cretaries of State.

*Had ye believed Moses, ye would have believed me; for he wrote
of me, Joh. v. 46.*

*All things must be fulfilled which were written in the Law of
Moses, and in the Prophets, and in the Psalms, concerning me,
Luk. xxiv. 44.*

*Good Men under the Law did not live and die like Swine,
feeding only on the Husks of these earthly Vanities, as some have
foolishly imagined. They had undoubtedly a future State in their
Eye, and lived by the Faith of it as well as we.*

Bp. BULL, Sermon 3. Vol. II. p. 337.

L O N D O N :

Printed by JAMES BETTENHAM,

And Sold by G. STRAHAN, at the Golden-Ball over-
against the Royal-Exchange; and JER. HOPKINSON
at Warwick. M,DCC,XLI.

THE
BRITISH MUSEUM
LONDON

THE
BRITISH MUSEUM
LONDON



1182

W

THE CONTENTS.

R evelation the Source of Knowledge in Philosophy and Divinity	Page 1—5
Proved from Rom. i. 19. 1 Cor. i. 21. ii. 11.	
— — — — —	p. 1—3
The Heavens an Image of the Trinity in Unity	p. 3—5
Hieroglyphical Representations necessary	p. 5, 6
The History of Adam and Eve	p. 6—50
The Garden, what; Pleasant, what,	p. 6—9
The Serpent, what; — — —	p. 10
The Temptation, what; —	p. 11—15
The Tree of Knowledge sacred to Light	p. —15
Why the Devil enter'd into a Serpent	p. 17
How the Fall made Adam and Eve naked	} p. 18—22
Why they cover'd their Nakedness	
Why with Fig-leaves —	p. 21
Why they hid themselves from God	p. 23—26
Adam's Sin, what; the Woman's, what	p. 26, 27
The Devils and their Sentence	p. 28—30
A 2	The

iv The C O N T E N T S.

<i>The Flood, was the Curse on the Earth</i>	p. 31
<i>Eve, why so named</i>	ibid.
<i>Bruising the Serpent's Head, what,</i>	p. 32, 33
<i>Coats of Skin, what ;</i>	p. 33—40
<i>Man like God, what ;</i>	p. 40—45
<i>Tree of Lives,</i>	p. 45—51
<i>Eat and live for ever, what ; and why removed from the Tree . — —</i>	ibid.
<i>The Cherubim, what ; why set up</i>	p. 51—60
<i>A Church Service from Adam to Moses</i>	p. 61—63
<i>The whole Earth of one Religion till after Abraham's Birth. — —</i>	p. 63
<i>Mr. Warburton sets the two Testaments at a Variance — —</i>	64
<i>The Cherubim disprove Mr. Warburton's Thesis</i>	65
<i>Were called the Presence of God</i>	p. 66 — 68
<i>Prove the Law was revealed to Adam</i>	p. 68
— — — — —	—70
<i>That He, and his Children understood it</i>	p. 70
— — — — —	—75
<i>The Jews understood the Types</i>	p. 75—90
<i>The name of the Sacrifices shew it</i>	p. 75
<i>The Atonement Money and Shew-bread, Memo- rials — —</i>	76
<i>The Stones on Aaron's Breast and Holy of Ho- lies</i>	p. 77
<i>The Hebrew not a ductile Language</i>	p. 78
<i>The Priest known to be a Type</i>	p. 79
2	<i>The</i>

The CONTENTS

<i>The Sacrifice, and Tabernacle, ditto</i>	p. 80—84
<i>Variety of Types, why</i>	p. 84—87
<i>The Sum of the Argument</i>	p. 87—90
<i>Man made in the Image of God</i>	p. 92
<i>Had an immortal Soul given him</i>	p. 92—94
<i>The Sabbath, eternal Rest</i>	p. 95
<i>Known to be so under the Law</i>	95—97
<i>Adam made for another Life</i>	p. 97
<i>An Objection answered</i>	p. 98—100
<i>Enoch's Translation; — a future State known in his Time —</i>	p. 100—102
<i>The History of the Patriarchs not obscure</i>	102
— — —	—108
<i>Idolatry, what; Covenant, what;</i>	p. 103
<i>Abraham prophesied that Christ should appear on Mount Moriah —</i>	p. 105
<i>The Patriarchs taught their Families Faith in Christ — —</i>	p. 107
<i>The Woman of Tekoah</i>	p. 109
<i>Warburton's false Quotation from Job detect- ed — — —</i>	p. 110
<i>That Job knew of a Resurrection, proved from the places Warburton cites to the contrary — — —</i>	p. 111
<i>Knew his Redeemer was to take Flesh</i>	p. 112
<i>King David knew of a Resurrection</i>	p. 114
<i>Objections answered — —</i>	p. 115
<i>Warburton detected in another false Quotation</i>	p. 116

vi The CONTENTS,

<i>The Psalms prove the Doctrines of Christianity</i>	p. 118
<i>Hezekiah's Prayer</i> —	p. 119
<i>The Objection from Jeremiah, answered</i>	p. 121

Texts out of the New Testament answered.

1 <i>Tim.</i> iv. 8. Bodily Exercise, &c.	p. 123
1 <i>Cor.</i> xv. 9. If in this Life only,	p. 125
<i>Heb.</i> vii. 15. A carnal Command- ment — — — }	p. 126
<i>Rom.</i> v. 12. Death reigned	
2 <i>Tim.</i> i. 10. Life and Immortality brought to Light — — —	p. 127
1 <i>Tim.</i> iii. 16. The Mystery manifested	p. 129
<i>Heb.</i> vii. 19. The Law made nothing perfect	p. 130
<i>The Law a Shadow, in what Sense,</i>	p. 131
<i>Job.</i> v. 45. Moses wrote of Christ	p. 133
<i>Heb.</i> viii. 6, 7. Christ, the Mediator,	p. 135
<i>Warburton reprov'd for giving ill Language</i>	p. 136
<i>Challenged to confute Mr. H. in any Point of Consequence</i> — — —	p. 137
<i>The Church not guilty of Indiscretion</i>	p. 139
<i>The Homilies condemn Warburton</i>	p. ibid.
<i>And the seventh Article; it vindicated</i>	p. 140
	— 142
<i>The Truths of Christianity preached through all Ages</i> — — —	142
	Warburton

The CONTENTS. vii

Warburton *mistakes* Expressions for Things p. 146

Temporal Blessings on the Jews, what p. 147

Types always necessary in Religion p. 149—152

Warburton's *Thesis condemns the Goodness and Justice of God; and destroys Morality* p. 153

Places in the Old Testament vindicated.

The Promises to Abraham p. 155—164

Gen. xlix 18. I have waited, &c. p. 165

Balaam's wish, Let me die, &c. p. 166

Pf. xvi. xvii. 15. xxiii. 6. xxxvi. 9. xlix. 15.

lxxiii. 24. ciii. 17. cxxxiii. 3. p. 171—176

Prov. xiv. 32. and Pf. xxxiii. 19, and lvi. 13.

p. 176—180

Places out of the New Testament vindicated.

I am the God of Abraham, &c. p. 180—184

Warburton *cites* Le Clerc *wrong* p. 181

The Parable of Dives and Lazarus p. 184—187

Ye think ye have eternal Life p. 188

The eleventh Chapter of the Hebrews, and the

Christian Faith vindicated p. 191—205

Bishop Bull vindicated p. 206. to the End.

The CONTENTS

Ward's in his last days, p. 140
 Temporal Blessings on the Jews, p. 147
 Types always necessary in Religion, p. 149-152
 Webster's Table containing the Gospels and
 Justice of God, and History, p. 153

Places in the Old Testament vindicated.

The Promise to Abraham, p. 155-164
 Gen. xlix. 18. I have visited, &c. p. 165
 Rebekah's wife, Gen. xxv. 26. p. 166
 P. xvi. xvii. 15. xxiii. 6. xxv. 9. xlii. 15.
 xxiii. 24. ciii. 17. cxxiii. 3. p. 171-176
 Prov. xiv. 32. and P. xxiii. 19. cxxiii. 13.
 p. 176-180

Places out of the New Testament vindicated.

I am the God of Abraham, &c. p. 180-184
 Warburton cites Le. Clave wrong, p. 181
 The Parable of Dives and Lazarus, p. 184-187
 Ye think ye have eternal life, p. 188
 The eternal City of the Hebrews, p. 189
 Christian Faith vindicated, p. 191-202
 Bishop Hall vindicated, p. 203. to the End

AN ESSAY

Towards Explaining the

Third Chapter of GENESIS,

AND THE

SPIRITUAL SENSE of the LAW.

REVELATION was the great Source of Knowledge, and all that we know, which is worth knowing, came to us by Streams derived from the Fountain of Truth, and Father of Lights. This is what the Scriptures have proved.

That which may be known of God, saith St. Paul (a), is manifest to Men, for God did manifest it to them; for the invisible things of him, from the Creation of the World, are clearly seen being understood by the things that are made, even his eternal Power and Godhead. Here we see a Revelation was made, and that from the Creation of the World; but the Text not only

(a) Rom. i. 19: (b) 1 Cor. ii. 14.

informs us of the *Date* of this Revelation, but of the *Manner*, viz. that Invisibles were perceived by what comes under Sense, *being understood by the things that are made*; They are the *Medium*, the *Types*, by which our Understanding is made to apprehend the eternal Power and Godhead. “ No Idea comes into “ the Mind but by Sense; or by supernatural “ Means by the Assistance of sensible Objects.” And it is generally allow’d, that all our Ideas come in by our Senses, the Organs of the Body; and therefore all the Ideas we have of *spiritual* things are borrowed from *material* ones: And whatever else might, the Knowledge which relates to God and another World could not have come, but by supernatural Help, into the Mind of Man — (a) *The things of a Man knows no Man, but the Spirit of Man which is in him; even so the things of God knoweth no one, but the Spirit of God.* Nor could the Spirit of God have made them known to Man, but by the Help of created Objects. *The World by Wisdom knew not God* (b). It was not within the Compass of their natural Abilities to have discover’d the Truths of God; or to receive *Information* from him about any thing which hath not a *parallel*, something *like* it, in this System.

Supposing now that Men did, or could, have arrived, without Revelation, at the most

(a) 1 Cor. ii. 11. (b) 1 Cor. i. 21.

perfect and extensive Knowledge of *Nature*, so as to have been acquainted with the Properties and Qualities of all the created things, which are any ways the Object of their Senses, this would not have let them into the Knowledge of the things of the other World; for which was like which, what things here resembled things there, he could never have known, but by comparing them together; or by Information from them who had seen both.

That Man by himself, without Instruction, could never have attained any great Degree of Knowledge in the Works of *Nature*, appears from the Ignorance of past Ages in all Parts of Philosophy; and the *confessed* Ignorance of the present Age in the principal Part, *the Cause of Motion*, or the Means by which inactive Matter is made to perform what we call the Operations of Nature. It was therefore necessary for God to teach Man the Knowledge of such things as he designed for Representatives of spiritual Objects; or rectify any mistaken Notions he might have got into his Head, if he had left him to himself in his Study of *the things that are made*. Suppose for instance, the Discovery to be made, were of *the Attributes of the Deity*. To what should they be resembled? *To whom shall God be likened; or what Likeness shall be compared unto him?* Some Resemblance must be form'd, "The eternal Power and Godhead
"are only to be seen, when render'd intelligi-
"ble, by the things that are made." God

points to the Element of the Air, and the Powers in it; the Unity of their Substance, and Trinity of *Agents*, their great and extensive Power, unwearied or constant Activity, dispensing to us all the Benefits of this Life, and their absolute Sway or Dominion in the material World. But till Man has a competent Knowledge of this powerful ruling Substance, and sees the *Trinity in Unity* which is *there*, the Comparison will be of no Service to him. It is a Book written in a Language he doth not understand. But if he hath got mistaken Notions about it, and forms his Ideas, as he naturally will, upon such Mistakes, he must necessarily have wrong Notions of God, and his Attributes. If instead of the ruling Agents, *Fire, Light and Spirit*, he hath taken it into his Head to annihilate their Substance, suppose the *Orbs* to swim, without any thing to swim in, and imagine I do not know what, Chimæra, of *Extension* without any thing *extended*; he will then talk of *infinite Space*, extend his God through it, or make it God, make two Substances exist in the same Place, with numberless other Contradictions to common Sense and Scripture; and if it were not owing to the bare Authority of a Creed, more than to the Evidence in Holy Writ, would reject, as many have done, all Belief in the ever-blessed Trinity, and of the Truths that depend upon it. So that it is not only necessary to have Recourse to Revelation for the Knowledge of
 God,

God, and his Attributes; but also for the Knowledge of *those Agents* in that ruling powerful Substance, which, like Man, are made after the *Image* and in the Likenesses of those who created them. And Philosophy and Divinity must come from the same Source, or Man will have no true Notion of either.

And as Ideas can only be had from *things*, the things themselves must be brought and placed within the Reach of our Senses; and what can't be so placed, must have a *Substitute*, or *Representative*, which will in some Measure supply the Defect. Hence arose what we call hieroglyphical Description, which is the most natural, and was the first way of writing made use of. It was known before *Letters*, and is in some Respects less liable to Error and Mistake, and is nearer the Fountain-Head of Knowledge; whereas *Letters* are the Substitutes of those *Things* or *Actions* we refer to; and the chief thing in understanding a *verbal* Description is to find what particular things the Words were designed to point out; but in the other Method of *Description*, the *Things* and *Actions* themselves are represented to the Eyes, and we have at the first Hand what we look for. Hence appears the Absurdity of supposing such Representations and hieroglyphical Actions to respect the *Body* only, and not the *Soul* in Conjunction with it. The History of the first Transactions betwixt God and Man is related in the hieroglyphical way,

and is to be considered as a *Picture*, in which we are to look beyond the *outward Figures*, as much as we do the Form of the *Letters* in our present way of Writing ; and the sacred Emblem, Tree, Plant, Beast, Fruit, and so on, are the *Letters* of the History. We may observe too, that as all Knowledge was first taught, then recorded, by emblematical Representations, when God is said to have given them such Emblems, taught and directed them to observe and study them, it implies that it was in order to teach them the Knowledge contained in them, as teaching a Person to read a Book would be supposed instructing him in the Meaning of the Words.

Let us consider the History of *Adam* and *Eve* in this View.

They are placed in a Garden planted by God himself. *And (a) the Lord God planted a Garden Eastward in Eden, and there he put the Man whom he had formed.*

This was not designed for a mere Pleasure Garden, to please their Eyes only ; nor were they placed in it for no other Purpose than to dress and keep it in Order ; it was a *religious Garden*, planted with a sacred Grove, watered with sacred Streams, and every way framed for Instruction.

Out (b) of the Ground made the Lord God to grow every Tree, that is pleasant to the Sight and good for Food.

(a) Gen. ii. 8. (b) Ver. 9.

The Soul wanted to *see* and be *fed* as much as the Body, and what they wanted to *see*, or know, needs no explaining; the word we translate *pleasant*, is from one End of the Bible to the other made use of to express that Pleasure, which arises from those spiritual Things which have the best Pretension to our Affections, as being in themselves infinitely more delightful, than any Thing which looks no farther than this Life can be. *Isaiah* reproaches the Idolaters of his Time, and tells them, *they (a) shall be ashamed of the Oaks they had desired*, or called *pleasant*, in the Sense above, *and of the Gardens which they had chosen*. In the same Sense, he speaks of *(b) Pictures of desire*; and in another Place, *They that make a graven Image are all of them Vanity, and their delectable Things shall not profit (c)*. The Prophet *Haggai* styles our Lord, *The Desire of all Nations (d)*, and as the Word *pleasant* or *desireable* is used for that which gives Pleasure to the Soul, so are *Eyes* and *Sight* for the Understanding; “ *מראה The Instrument of Vision*, is “ a Term universally used for this Species of “ Emblems, which were constituted to shew “ the Originals.” That *Good* and *Food* are used in the same Way of speaking will hardly be denied. So the Trees, Plants, and the other hieroglyphical Representations, usually in such Gardens, as this in *Eden* was, by their

(a) Isa. i. 29.

(b) Ibid. ii. 16.

(c) Ibid. xlv. 9.

(d) Hag. ii. 8.

Disposition, Use, and Names given them, were to convey Lessons to their Mind, to feed it as well as the Body, delight the Understanding, as well as please the Eye, by pointing out those *Persons* and *Things* to them who were to support, protect, and give Pleasure to their Souls and Bodies both.

To make this Method of Instruction the more effectual, such Trees were pitched upon as gave the nearest parallel Ideas; and the Names of what they, and the Fruit they bore, were made Emblems of, were fixed to them, so the *Picture* and the *Original* bore the same Name. And what a Variety of Ideas arise from Trees growing in only their natural Form, without the Help of Art and Contrivance, which might infinitely augment the Store, and make them as subservient to Learning and Instruction, as useful helps to a *Scholar* as a *Master* would wish to have. It is easy to see, that almost every Benefit we can conceive the Soul capable of enjoying, might be represented by a skillful Artist in this Way, and some such Way *must have been* made use of. The most delicious Fruits, the most fragrant Smells, and the most agreeable Drinks naturally come from this Quarter. Shade, Shelter and Protection, equally a Defence from the Extreame of Heat and Cold, are their common Gifts———Glory, Beauty, Grandeur, Strength, Durableness are Ideas frequently borrowed from them—*High as the Cedars, tall as*
the

the Oaks (a)—more beautiful than any Tree in the Garden of God—like in Glory and Greatness among the Trees of Eden (b). With many such Comparisons we meet with in Scripture. I shall cite one Text here, though it is not rightly translated from the *Lamentations*, which shews plainly enough that *the Garden* was of the same Use, as the Tabernacle and its Appurtenances afterwards were.—The Prophet is lamenting the Loss of the sacred Emblems, and says, *The Lord יחמט כנן שכו bath violently taken away his Tabernacle as he did the Garden, he has destroyed his Places of the Assembly, and so on.*

In the Garden of *Eden*, says *Moses*, was every sacred Tree, emblematical Trees of all Sorts and Kinds, though there are but two mentioned in the Account of the *Fall*, Ver. 9. a Tree, called *Life's*; and a Tree named, *The Knowledge of Good and Evil*. But these were not all whose Use and Benefits they were acquainted with, so whose emblematical Use was known to them, as appears from the Use they made of another Tree after they had sinned.

Ver. 16. *The Lord God commanded the Man, saying, of every Tree of the Garden thou mayst freely eat: but of the Tree of the Knowledge of Good and Evil thou shalt not eat.*

Why this Tree was forbid, appears afterwards: God foresaw what Temptation would

(a) Amos ii. 9.

(b) Ezek. xxxi.

be offered them. He knew that Satan, an Apostate Spirit or fallen Angel, would make this Tree a sacramental Test ; that is, the eating its Fruit an outward Proof of their inward Consent to a Suggestion he should instill into their Minds, for such a Consideration of a few Circumstances attending this Part of the Story will shew it to have been, and therefore God forbids their tasting its Fruit, not by Way of Trial of Obedience, but as a friendly Caution, and that a Caution against a Crime of the Mind, the inward Thing signified by that outward Pledge, which was all he could do consistent with that State of *Freedom* and of *Trial* which they were now in. The Event soon shewed the Goodness of God in this Precaution, for no sooner had he instructed these his new Creatures, in such Points as were necessary to be known in order to make their Trial a fair and just one, and left them to themselves, no sooner was this done, but the Tempter attacks them.—Cap. iii. Ver. 1. “ *The Serpent was more subtile than any Beast of the Field which the Lord God had made.*—Ver. 4. “ *And he said unto the Woman, ye shall not surely die. For God doth know, that in the Day ye eat thereof, then your Eyes shall be opened: And ye shall be as Gods knowing Good and Evil.*”

That the Serpent was possessed by some other Creature is plain from this Part of Scripture alone, because the whole Species of Serpents is
mute,

mute, destitute of the Organs of Speech, as well as of all rational Faculties, which were exerted by some Agent in this particular Serpent. What Power the Apostate Angels have, and how they exert it we know not, but that an immaterial or spiritual Creature hath the Power of acting in, and directing the Organs of mechanised Matter we are assured of, because our Souls act so in our Bodies, and that it was some spiritual Agent which made Use of the Serpent on this Occasion is certain, because no created material Being hath any such Power. Man alone of all Creatures in this World is endowed with Reason and the Organs of Speech, but there was no other Man then in Being; and if there had, he could not have made that Use of the Serpent which some Creature here did. That it was a wicked, malicious and evil Spirit, which was concerned is plain, because it was to their Ruin that he tempted them.—He attacks the Woman the weaker Sex first, and though he found her sufficiently apprized of the Prohibition which had been given *Adam*, and of the Penalty threatened to be inflicted on Disobedience, yet with a diabolical Assurance affirms, that all was a Delusion, an Imposition on their Ignorance and Credulity.—“ *Hath God said that ye shall not eat of every Tree of the Garden lest ye die? Ver. 4. And the Serpent said unto the Woman, ye shall not surely die. For God doth know that in the Day ye eat thereof,*
“ *then*

*“ then your Eyes shall be opened : And ye shall
 “ be as Gods knowing Good and Evil.”* The
 Temptation laid in her Way was the *opening*
her Eyes, a Promise that her Capacity should
 be enlarged so as to discern betwixt Good and
 Evil, and consequently have a Power of choos-
 ing the one and refusing the other, and thereby
 of making herself happy independent of God,
 and without following the Method which his
 Goodness had put them in.—The Assertion,
 that God knew this would be the Effect of eat-
 ing the forbidden Fruit, and that he had for
 that Reason forbidden it, was the most wicked
 and false Assertion which the Malice of the
 grand Apostate could possibly make, and *Eve*
 must have cast off all Love of God and Gra-
 titude towards him; all Dependance on and
 Hopes of farther Favour from him before she
 could listen to it, or on such a Suggestion make
 the Trial. No greater Sin could be committed.
 It was Treason against the King of the whole
 World, denying his Right to govern them,
 and attempting to withdraw themselves from
 his Obedience and make themselves indepen-
 dent. It was calling his Goodness in Question
 by harbouring that foolish Imagination that he
 had forbid them the Use of that Tree in order
 to keep them dependent, minding as it were to
 force their Subjection by taking Advantage of
 their Necessity, in order to which he had im-
 posed on their Ignorance in frightening them,
 from a Road which led so directly to their
 Happiness.

Happiness.—Or else it was denying his Wisdom, and saying they knew better than he what would make them happy. Thus did *Eve* at once fling herself out of the Protection of God, separate herself from her only Support, her truest and best Friend, and if Man can't be happy independent of God, put herself in the high Road to Misery and Destruction: Nay farther, if Justice be an Attribute of God, she actually subjected herself to eternal Misery, since she was immortal.

But where may it be asked is the Connexion, betwixt eating a Fruit and obtaining Knowledge? Suppose her wicked enough to attempt an Independency on God, ungrateful enough to suspect his Goodness who had made her out of nothing, and surrounded her with so much Happiness as she then enjoyed, how could she be silly enough to imagine any the least Probability, that an Apple, a *material* Fruit, could open the Eyes of her Mind and enlarge her Understanding? Where is the Connexion betwixt the *Cause* and *Effect*, the least most remote Dependence of one on the other?

To answer this Question I must ask, what Substance, Power, Person or Thing this Tree was made an Emblem of. It was a Substitute, Figure, or Representative of something or other, and the Effect promised to proceed from eating of its Fruit, was to be the Gift of that *Power* it was dedicated to. Eating of the

Fruit of the Tree, was desiring to possess herself of the Fruit or Effect of that Power on her Mind, putting herself under its Protection, and was as expressive of such a Design, as the eating of Bread and drinking Wine is of our Faith in Christ, and of our Desire to partake of the Benefits he hath purchased for us, *viz.* Support and Nourishment to the Soul. The eating the Fruit of this Tree by *Eve* was intended as a sacramental Act, and enlisting herself in the Service of that *Power*, whose Emblem or Substitute the Tree was. This indeed is the chief Point in Dispute, and saying that the Tree was sacred or consecrated to a religious Use, or in general to some emblematical Purpose, may be thought begging the Question—I think not, because it appears already in general, that the Garden was designed as a Place of Contemplation, whence they were to gather the Knowledge of spiritual Things, and that Gardens were made Use of by all Nations to this Purpose we very well know: We have abundant Evidence that they had their sacred Gardens and Trees dedicated to their Gods. And the Text positively asserts that this was a *sacred Tree*, and the Scripture way, and which is the most natural and obvious, is to call the *Type* and *Antitype* by the same Name, and so the Name of a sacred Beast, Tree, Plant, Flower, or whatever else it is, will of itself alone shew what it was made a Type or Substitute of. This Tree is called *Knowledge*, and

so was a Substitute of some *Power* which was supposed capable of giving Knowledge, whatever *Power* it was. What Inducements there might be, or what Train of *Reasoning* the Devil made use of to induce *Eve* to imagine that Knowledge could be the Gift of any other *Power* besides God, or that there could be any Method better than what God had put them into, we know not; nor is it necessary, in order to shew the general Design of the sacramental Act which hath been so often ridiculed by foolish, hardy, unthinking Men, who pretend their Ignorance of the meaning of these Hieroglyphical Parts of Scripture will be an Excuse for burlesquing them: But the Nature of the Crime, the Heinousness of it, and the Goodness of God in giving them the Precaution, appear by considering the Tree and Fruit in this View. When we know what *Power* the Tree was a Substitute of, we shall be better Judges of the Probability there might be of any Person's being induced to trust to it for Knowledge, and these Things put together will give the Story *that Air of Probability* which *the Fools* pretend it wants.

Later Scriptures, and the Heathen Writings shew pretty plainly that this Tree was the Representative of that *Power* which really doth support our Bodies and their Faculties, and which by the Heathens was universally believed to give Wisdom and support the Faculties of the Soul. So the Folly she was guilty of was
moral,

moral, not *natural* Folly or Stupidity. I must leave it to the Reader to consider whether the Use of such Gardens as this in *Eden* was.— The Place of this Tree in the Garden.— The Allusions to it in Scripture, and the Customs of the Heathen World, which are too long to trace here, do not prove that this Tree was sacred to the *Light*, the God of *Wisdom* with all the World but Believers, and the only Object which was ever set up against God in this respect, and then the eating it's Fruit bespeaks its own Design. If the Tree was a *Representative*, it's Fruit must be so : And the eating it's Fruit a *Representative* Act likewise. God had made this Tree, which was in the midst of the Garden as the Sun is, a Figure or Substitute of the *Light*, but the Devil made it the Tree of *Knowledge*. That the Light of Nature could open the Eyes, and give us a View of Heaven, and the Things in it, is a Suggestion that came first from the Enemy of our Happiness, and hath imposed upon many who would take it as an Indignity to be put upon the same Level for Understanding with *Eve*.

As this Tree was sacred to the Power of the Air which supports our Bodies, and which lower down was almost universally supposed to be the Author and Giver of Wisdom, so eating of its Fruit a very proper Test of her having enlisted herself into the Service of that *Power*, we shall likewise by pursuing the same
Train

Train of thinking see the Reason of the Deceiver's entering into the Serpent to compass his malicious End; the Propriety, I say, of the Devil's assuming this Shape will appear by recollecting, that in the first Ages of the World when they had no *Letters*, nor Writing, but hieroglyphically, a Serpent was one of the sacred Beasts they made use of as an Emblem, Type, or Representative of the same Power with the Tree above-mentioned, viz. of the *Light*; hence St. Paul saith, " The Devil was transformed into an " Angel, i. e. the *Agent, Representative* or " *Personator* of the *Light* (a); for so it should have been translated, or by some such Term as would import, that this Creature was the Hieroglyphical Mark for *Light*, and so the *Hebrew* and *Greek* Words we translate *Angel* do signify. The Devil then pretends himself an Ambassador from this imaginary King, a Prophet sent by this supposed God, and persuades her to worship it as the God of Wisdom, and by eating of the Fruit of the Tree, which bore the Image or Character of this fictitious Potentate, give outward Proof of her inward Consent that Wisdom was in his Gift, and of her Desire to receive it from him. Which besides what is said before, was making a God of it and denying the God that is above (b). The Heathens Writings are full of

(a) 2 Cor. xi. 14.

(b) Job xxxi. 28.

Evidence, that *Light* was the God of *Knowledge*, — and that Serpents were sacred to it. — Serpents irradiated in their sacred Pictures, and the extreme Reverence paid to this Animal in Heathen Countries to this Day, make it unnecessary to say any Thing more in Proof or Illustration of this Particular.

The next Step which *Eve* took, was to draw her Husband into the same Snare; that they might stand or fall together *ver. 6*. Surely it is no meer Conjecture to say she did it that she might not be deprived of her Husband, and that he consented out of Fondness to her, “hearkning (a) to her Voice” is all he is charged with.

When they had committed the Sin, they did, as People sometimes do, reflect upon what they had done. No Effect followed, but a Sense of Guilt and Fear of Punishment. “*The Eyes of both of them were open’d,*” *ver. 7*. but it was to their Shame and Confusion, “*they knew that they were naked.*”

Take these Expressions literally, and they will imply that their Eyes were shut till they had eaten the Apple, and that they were naked without knowing it; but he that can suppose they did not see or feel they had no Clothes on, whilst they had none, or that they were blind before, must be blind himself; and he that can suppose *Moses* meant so and *no more*,

(a) *Ver. 17.*

I shall beg of, to take the *Fool* back to himself.

What then are we to understand here, and how are we to construe it? The Text says, " They (a) were naked before the Fall, the Man and his Wife, and were not ashamed," and that after the Fall " their Eyes were opened, and they knew they were naked, " and were ashamed of being so." Mutual Inclination was the Cause of one's tempting, and the other's yielding to the Temptation; so the Seat of Concupiscence, reminding them of their Sin, gave them Shame and Remorse: Till now being naked gave them no Disgust, Innocence had nothing to be ashamed of, but Guilt had, they therefore are said to have known " they were naked," *i. e.* to be sensible of their Shame; and in Consequence of that Shame to have covered their Nakedness.— But with what Design! only to conceal it from each other's Sight? Doubtless they had a further View. Had they not been ashamed of what they had done, they need not have been ashamed of what tempted them to do it. By making therefore themselves *Girdles* to cover their Nakedness, they acknowledged their Sin, shewed themselves ashamed of, and sorry for it.

No emblematical Act could be more proper than this was to confess their Guilt by; nor could their inward Remorse, Shame and

(a) Chap. ii. ver. 25.

Confusion of Mind be expressed with greater Propriety, than by Ideas borrowed from this natural Modesty. The wicked and abandoned want this Shame, and Custom will wear it out. Had *Adam* been abandoned, and thought of his Crime with Pleasure and Satisfaction, that which immediately occasioned it would have been as agreeable to his Sight, as the Crime was. Children have no Sense of Shame on seeing each other naked, and whether that Shame which it gives modest adult Persons, be the Effect of natural Reflection, Education, or otherwise occasioned, matters not. Nakedness is offensive to Modesty. The Parts are cover'd by all Nations, and the Idea from thence of *Shame* is a very natural, strong and expressive one. The Idea of *Shame* arises as naturally from hence, and the Word for the one, may be used for the other, with as much Propriety as the *Eyes* are for *Knowledge*, or the *Hand* for *Power*. Covering these Parts would on this Account, I say, be very expressive of Shame and Confusion of Mind, which they desired to be covered or taken from them, put out of Sight. This Idea would be natural, and the Description under this Phrase proper, though it should be supposed that mutual Desire to each other had no share in their Crime. But if it had, this single Act of covering their *Nakedness* says as much at once, as a large Description could do if told in Words. It was pleading, as he did afterwards, that the

Woman

Woman was his Temptation.—That he was sensible of his Folly, ashamed and sorry for it, and that he hoped this would qualify him for Mercy, since the Inclination, which God had planted in him, had overswayed his Reason, and the Infirmary of his Flesh, rather than the Judgment of his Mind, was to be accountable for it.

Some Men have pretended to laugh at saying, that original Sin was the Cause of this natural Modesty; but why should it be thought unnatural for *Adam* to hate to see *that*, which drew him into a Sin which gave him so much Uneasiness, and was attended with such dreadful Consequences? Our Lord says, “if thy right Hand offend thee,” that is, draw thee into Sin, cut it off. He covered or put out of Sight what was to him disagreeable, as having been the Occasion of his Sin, the Memory of which, or that which occasioned it, must be offensive to the true Penitent. They therefore covered their *Shame*, wished it might be cover'd from the Sight of God, or that he would overlook it. They were ashamed of themselves, of each other, but more especially of the culpable Parts, and made a Girdle of *Fig-Leaves* to hide them. Why they chose *Fig-Leaves* for this Purpose, or a Branch of the *Fig-Tree*, hath occasioned much Dispute; it was a Branch of תאנה *Grief, Sorrow, Affliction*; this the Name of the Tree signifies, and their being under *Grief*, was what they meant to

represent. And the Name of *Contrition*, *Affliction*, or *Fretting* was very properly affixed to this Tree, because of the roughness or prickliness of the Leaves, which like so many Thorns or Briars fret and tear what they rub against. We find Hair-Cloths were wore next the Skin with the same Intent, as expressive of the same Thing in the emblematical Way. Fretting if continued on the Body would soon reduce it to its primitive Dust, and if this was not ultimately to acknowledge they deserved Death, *i. e.* to be dissolved, yet this is certain, that we borrow the Words *Contrition*, *Affliction*, and the like, from the Body, and apply them to the Mind, to express that Passion we call *Grief*, and that is the emblematical Name of the Fig-Tree, which shews plain enough the general Design of covering their Nakedness, since it was putting *Grief* on their *Shame* and *afflicting* themselves for what they had done. This is the Interpretation which *Irenæus* gives of the Use of Fig-Leaves on this Occasion, and *Nature* speaks the same Thing.

Thus, “being naked without being ashamed,” before the Fall—“Their Eyes being opened”—“Knowing they were naked”—“Being ashamed”—“Covering their Nakedness,” and so on, after the Fall, are all double Expressions, or what we call emblematical and figurative—So also the Tree—its Fruit—its being pleasant as an Instrument of Vision.—Good for Food—A Tree to be desired

fired—to make one wise—Eating of the Fruit—
The Serpent—His talking, and the like, must
all lead us beyond the outward Letter, and be
construed by the general Design of the Whole,
remembring that *visible* Things are made to
stand for *invisible* ones.

It can't be supposed that *Adam* and *Eve*,
before the Fall, had no stated Time or Place
of Worship; they had frequently conversed
with God, in whatever manner it was he ma-
nifested himself to them; and we find that
lower down the Evening, or Time of Day
which *Moses* hath philosophically describ'd, and
we translate *the Cool of the Day*, was a stated
Time of Worship. And now it was when
Ver. 8. “*They heard the Sound of the Lord God*
“*walking in the Garden.*” It is plain, from
hence, they had been used to meet God, and
that the *Sound* of his coming was well known
to them, otherwise they could not have col-
lected from it that he was coming. These
Intercourses with God must before have been
as agreeable as they were useful; but now the
Scene was changed, and they fled from the
Face of God. Conscious Guilt made them a-
fraid of the Presence of their Judge, and they
hid themselves from it in the Midst of the
(a) Grove in the Garden. They could not
think God did not see them, for they must
know all things were open to his Sight. The

(a) בתוך עץ הדגן

C 4

Center

Center of these Gardens was like the Holy of Holies, the most sacred Part of their Silvan Temples, and flying to it was like flying to the Altar for Sanctuary, for Refuge from a Sentence which they expected, and acknowledged they deserved. The *Oak* was afterwards the Tree under which they built their Altars, and offered their Sacrifices at, and was held sacred as an Emblem of Shelter and Protection; and hence, from one of its Names, from *אֹשֶׁל*, *Ajylum* seems to have taken its Etymology, as the sacred Use of Trees did, without Doubt, from this original Plan.

Ver. 9. "*And the Lord God called unto Adam, and said unto him, Where art thou? And he said, I heard thy Voice in the Garden; and I was afraid because I was naked, and I hid myself.*"

This is not spoken of his being naked as to his private Parts, they were cover'd before; nor doth it say he was *ashamed*, but that he was *afraid* to appear naked before God. They were ashamed to appear naked before each other, as being ashamed of the Folly their Nakedness had drawn them into; and to express that *Shame*, and their Desire to have that *Shame covered*, or their Sin pardoned, cover'd with *Grief* the Instruments of Lust, the Use of which had been their Temptation. What then was *Adam* afraid of in being naked, or having no Clothes on his Body? If he had been used to go so, it must have been by Di-
vine

vine Direction, Permission at least, and he must have often appeared before God in that Condition. As a great Man says on this Text, the Nakedness which made him afraid of appearing in the Divine Presence was a Nakedness of his own, not of God's making, and is the same sort of Nakedness spoke of by *Moses* in *Exodus* (a): "*Moses* saw that the People were naked, for *Aaron* had made them naked to their Shame." Not stript of their Clothes, but despoiled them of their sacred Emblems, the Badges of the Divine Favour, Memorials of the Mercy of God, which was promised them through the Mediator. Whilst they had these on the Wrath of God could not fall on them without Breach of Promise, and laying these aside was laying aside their Claim to his Protection; laying them aside in the *Israelites*, indeed, was but the Consequence of the Sin they relapsed into; and so it was the Transgression which made them naked, and this it was which had made *Adam* naked; and the Phrase is proper enough, for naked is weak defenceless: So he had nothing to atone for, or cover his Body from Justice, and might well be afraid. As he had nothing to cover him, he confesses his Guilt, makes Proof of his Repentance and Shame for what he had done by the emblematical Act above, and here acknowledges his Inability to satisfy

(a) xxxii. 25.

Justice, by saying he was *naked* and *afraid*, which he gives as the Reason for covering his Body, if I may so say, with the Trees in the Garden; why he fled to the Center of the sacred Grove is plain, it was taking Sanctuary.

Moses is very short, and gives but Hints as it were, of what happened in *Paradise*; but when he wrote, these things were well understood; and supplying what these Hints suppose understood, (which the Scripture wrote since will teach us) will make these things well understood again; but if People will judge without understanding what they judge about, they must err. Whether they who do err in these Matters for want of a proper Examination are blame-worthy, and how far they are blame-able, or what their Degree of Guilt is, since it is the Word of God is concerned, may be a proper Question for a Man of Sense to reflect on. But to proceed.

On *Adam's* pleading to God that he was *naked*, as the Reason of his taking Sanctuary, God says, Ver. 11. "*Who told thee (or rather, what hath shewn thee) that thou was naked?*" What Reason have you to think you wanted something to cover you from my Wrath? Why do you cry out for Mercy, and beg your Life at my Hands? Is it forfeited? Have you incurred the Penalty by committing the Sin, the Wages whereof you know is Death? *Adam* confesses he had, but pleads in Excuse, that he did it from Inclination to the Woman
I which

which God had given him; his Passion over-
 sway'd his Reason. His Crime was Excess of
 the first of the moral Duties, no Breach of
 Morality, but over-fondness to his Wife.
 Ver. 12. "*And the Man said, The Woman which*
" thou gavest to be with me, she gave me of
" the Tree and I did eat." The Woman's
 was Pride, and she pleads that the Serpent,
 that is, the Devil through that Creature, had
 blown up her Pride, filled her with false
 Hopes, made her believe that laying Revela-
 tion aside would make a Goddess of her, give
 her the Power by her own Abilities of finding
 out what was good, " That she should be as
 " God, knowing Good and Evil." *And the*
Woman said, The Serpent beguiled me and I did
eat. He beguiled her indeed, as the *English*
 says; but the Original says more, that he did
 it by flattering her, blowing up her Pride.
 The Bait was the *noble Privilege* of finding
 the Way to Knowledge without the Guidance
 and Direction of the revealed Will of God.
 This is the Bait the Devil still covers his Hook
 with, and it is Pride which makes so many
 Fools gorge it. The Crime is the same in
 Kind, but infinitely augmented in Degree, be-
 cause it is abusing the Offer of Pardon, and
 falling a second time, even after the Trial hath
 been made and found not to answer.

The Devil was an old Offender, had sinned
 before, and so was condemned without being
 admitted to plead any Excuse. He had no-
 thing

thing to plead but Malice, or if he had, nothing that was sufficient to mitigate his Crime and Punishment, and therefore he is sentenced without being heard, and that in Words suitable to the Dress he had put on, and which convey the nearest strongest parallel Ideas which the Case would admit of. Ver. 14. *And the Lord God said unto the Serpent, because thou hast done this, thou art cursed above all Cattle, and above every Beast of the Field; upon thy Belly shalt thou go, and Dust shalt thou eat all the Days of thy Life.* God might have spoken to the Devil in a Language which in his own way would have expressed the Punishment he was condemned to; but Man would not then have understood it. Things purely spiritual are not the Object of our Senses; nor, but by the Intervention of material Pictures, the Subject of our Understandings. The Language in the Text is, as I said, suitable to the Dress the Devil had put on, level to the Capacity of the Man, and so understood by both Parties; and to take it literally, is as perverse, silly and ridiculous as taking a Picture for the Original—More childish than Children are, who readily enough take the Design of a Fable. The Serpent goes upon his Belly now, eats the most contemptible sort of Food, and did so when Satan was sentenced under those Expressions, to be the most contemptible, low, groveling, miserable Thing of all the Creatures in the Field of God. Had not the Serpent then

then been this sort of Creature, the intended Ideas could not have been borrowed from it. So had it not been, or rather would it not naturally have been, the Fate of Women to have born Children, and that with great Pains and Torments, there would have wanted Words, I mean there would have wanted Things proper to the Condition of the Party concerned, to have expressed her Sentence by. Ver. 16. *Unto the Woman he said, I will greatly multiply thy Sorrow and thy Conception; in Sorrow shalt thou bring forth Children; and thy Desire shall be to thy Husband, and he shall rule over thee.*

Adam's Sentence is given in the same emblematical or figurative Way of Expression, and the Ideas are only to be rectified by remembering that it is spiritual Labour, the Care and Anxiety of reforming the Soul, governing the Passions, the Fear and Trembling which attend the working out our Salvation that are spoke of, and that in this Language, because it was suitable to the Nature and Condition of the Man; because the Ideas arise from such Employments as he was to be exercised in; and from that Scene of Cares, Labour and Anxiety, which is necessarily now, and must have been, when Men had multiplied, the Lot and Portion of most Men, if Man had not fallen. Ver. 17. And unto Adam he said, Because thou hast hearkened unto the Voice of thy Wife, and hast eaten of the Tree, which I commanded thee, saying,

ing, thou shalt not eat of it, cursed is the Ground for thy Sake; in Sorrow shalt thou eat of it all the Days of thy Life. Thorns also and Thistles shall it bring forth to thee; and thou shalt eat the Herb of the Field. In the Sweat of thy Face shalt thou eat Bread, till thou return unto the Ground. The Ground naturally produces Thorns and Briars; and the Labour which must, and did then, or soon after attend the providing a necessary Sustenance, as naturally makes us sweat. So the Pains of our first Birth are the Picture of those which attend our new, or second, Birth, our Regeneration. The Care and Trouble which is requisite to procure the Bread that perishes, are taken, and that without great Violence, or straining the Rules of Logic, to express the Labour requisite to procure the Bread that endures to everlasting Life. What the Thorns and Briars are, which infest the Garden of God, and choak the useful Herbs, and what Use they commonly are, or ought to be put to, needs not to be mentioned.

But though the Sentence on *Adam* is so expressed as to convey a spiritual Meaning, and was to reach his Soul and describe its Condition, or State of Trial it was then to enter into, and the Tribulation he and his were to meet with in the new Way which it was now necessary for them to take in order to get to Heaven; yet was there a Curse denounced on the Earth, and consequently on Man, whose mortal

tal Part is sustained by the Fruits of the Earth. This Curse was executed by the Flood, as appears, Chap. v. 29. from the Reason *Lamech* gives for naming his Son *Noah*, because "he was" to comfort them from the Labour they were "sentenced to earn their Bread with, and" from the Sorrow with which they were to "eat it, and from the Curse which the Lord" had lain on the Ground." This he did by surviving the Flood, repeopling the World again, and continuing down the Line from which *He* was to, and did, descend, *who himself* bore the Curse pronounced on Man. And this Custom of naming Persons from some extraordinary Event or Circumstance of their Lives, explains the next Verse of the Chapter immediately before us, Ver. 20. *And Adam called his Wife's Name Eve, because she was* (to be in time) *the Mother of that perfect one who hath Life in himself, and so the Power of giving and sustaining Life in others.* This the Words we translate *all living* imply; and *Eve* is to bring some hidden thing to Light, which was done when "(a) God was manifest in the" "Flesh;" and "the (b) Mystery which was" kept secret since the World began revealed "unto Men." "Which (c) Mystery was" "Christ among us, the Hope of Glory." By affixing this expressive, descriptive Name to his Wife, he confessed his Faith in the Promise

(a) 1 Tim. iii. 16. (b) i. 16, 26. (c) Col. i. 26.

above, that “ *the Seed of the Woman should bruise the Serpent’s Head.*” Which was a Promise that somebody born of a Woman should “ destroy him who had the Power of Death, “ that is, the Devil.” Properly enough call’d the *Head* of the Serpent, as being the Head, chief or principal Part of the Serpent, which he was then in when he tempted *Eve*, and because there the Poison lies. Bruising the Head of the Serpent, is bruising his most tender and mortal Part. You may cut their Bodies to Pieces and not kill them; but a very small Bruise on the Head is immediate Death; and their (a) Wisdom which we are commanded to imitate, lies in the constant Care they use to cover their Heads when any Danger threatens them; they will endure any thing rather than expose it naked. The Moral to that Part of the Parable, *the Enmity between the Serpent and the Woman, the Seed of the Serpent and the Seed of the Woman* needs no Comment.

We are not to suppose that what is here related to have passed between God and our first Parents is all that did pass between them. Doubtless God made them understand what he meant; and that *Adam* did understand it, is plain from the Name *Eve*, and the Reason assigned why he gave that Name to his Wife. They therefore knew who that Seed was which was to come, what his bruising the Head of

(a) Mat. x. 16.

the Serpent meant, and what the Serpent's bruising his Heel meant likewise; then they must know also, that the Seed of the Woman, who was to conquer this great Enemy of theirs, was to be in part mortal, was to suffer, die, and rise again, otherwise how could the Serpent bruise the Heel, the lowest, inferior Part of the *Seed*, and the *Seed* bruise his Head? Had he not died, his Heel had not been bruised—Had he not risen from the Dead, where had been his Conquest over the wicked Spirit, his Triumph over Satan? How else could he, as *St. Paul* expresses it in the Words just cited, “ have destroyed, through Death, “ him that had the Power of Death, that is, “ the Devil?” And now we see by the Completion his Conquest, and the Manner of his Conquest, over the Devil, we may defy the Wit of Men or Angels to draw a more lively Picture, a more exact Description of this glorious Transaction, than is given us in the short Picture before us: and if they who were most concerned to understand it, and to whom it was first given, did really understand it, then the whole Affair of Christianity was revealed to them. And as they understood this, so did they likewise another Circumstance, related *Ver. 21. Unto Adam also and to his Wife did the Lord God make Coats of Skins, and clothed them.*

Some People have been weak enough to think that this was only to keep them warm.

D

Such

Such a Covering would have been wanted most at their first Creation, not after Custom had made going naked easy and familiar to them. If it was then an hieroglyphical Action, as it appears the other Parts of this History were, what was meant by it?

It had been revealed to them that a Person should come who had full Power to destroy the Devil, and abolish Death, which they had subjected themselves to: And that he was to do this *through Death*, that is, by undergoing Death, and we know that Sacrifice was the appointed Memorial, Type and Figure of his Death, which was now, or let who can, shew when it was, instituted to this Purpose. Sacrifice could not be the Invention of Man, nor acceptable to God unless by his own Appointment. The first mention we have of what was indisputably a Sacrifice, is afterwards and there occasionally only; but that Sacrifice had been appointed before appears beyond Dispute, by the Expression, “ that (a) it was at “ the End of the Days, that *Cain* brought his “ Offering.” There was then an appointed Time to sacrifice at, consequently the Species of Sacrifice was appointed—The Place—The Person, and all other necessary Circumstances must be appointed likewise. The Design why they sacrificed must be known also, this was as a Memorial of the *great Sacrifice*, will it not then follow that Sacrifice was appointed as a

(a) Chap. iv. 3.

Memorial or Type, as soon as the great Sacrifice it was a Figure of was promised? There was as much Reason to appoint the *Type* now, as to promise the real *Sacrifice* now. The one was done in Paradise, therefore the other. By an Accident soon after, it appears that Sacrifice was appointed about the Time, or not long after the Fall; the direct Time when it was appointed is not mentioned, unless implied or comprehended in the general Discovery made to them of the Terms of the new Covenant, or of the Method which God had designed to take to redeem them: But the Hint about *Cain's* sacrificing duly considered, and the Nature of the Case will give us Reason to conclude that the necessary Types, and memorial Ceremonies were now appointed, and that will open our way to answer the Question last proposed — What the hieroglyphical Action of clothing them with Skins might import. That it was an emblematical or sacramental Act, appears from what has been said—from the whole Drift of the Narration—The Folly of taking it in any other View, and because it was something more than a common Nakedness they wanted a Covering to; it was a Nakedness their Sin had made. They wanted not the Covering till after their Fall. It was a Protection from divine Justice, a Cover from the Wrath of God they stood in need of. And what was it which was to protect them from Law and Justice? Nothing but the Blood of

Christ could do this. Nothing but the Sacrifice and Death of the Lamb of God, could appease the Anger and bear the Weight of the Wrath of God. They had just received a Promise that their Surety would in due Time appear and take the Burthen upon him. They had expressed their Reliance upon his Merits, and thankfully accepted the new Terms, and so were to be pardoned, but (a) "without shedding of Blood there could be no Remission of Sin," therefore Blood was shed. But whose Blood! Christ was not then on Earth, God was not yet incarnate, therefore it must be the Blood of his Type, Calves, Lambs and Kids, which were shed for this Purpose, and as we call the Picture and Original by the same Name, their Blood was his Blood, their Covering his Covering, and so on. Therefore putting on their Covering, was being covered by him, putting on Christ, and investing them with the Benefits of his Death. *Allusions* of this Nature are very frequent in Scripture, too frequent to need citing, and too plain to need a Comment. I shall cite but one, because of the double Idea in it. (b) "I counsel thee to buy of me white Raiment that thou mayst be clothed, and that the Shame of thy Nakedness do not appear." When *Moses* was sent to re-institute the Law, correct the Errors which had crept in, and teach again such necessary Parts as Time, I-

(a) Heb. ix. 22.

(b) Rev. iii. 18.

magination,

imagination, Carelessness or Design had made them neglect, amongst other Things *the Skin* of the Sacrifice was ordered to be given to the Priest, not surely for the Value of it, for what he could sell it for; but *typically* to acknowledge that the Covering was the *Priest's*. That from him they were to look for what was to cover and protect them, and that not from the legal Priest, but from him whom the Priest was a Type of. Christ was both the *Priest* and *Sacrifice*, for he offered up himself. It will follow, from what hath been said, by direct Consequence, that the Skins God clothed them with in Paradise after the Fall, and after the Promise of Christ was given by God, accepted of by them, and that with full Faith, and a due Sense of Gratitude; it follows, I say, by direct Consequence, that the Skins they were covered with, were the Skins of the sacrificed Beasts, put on them by Way of a *Sacrament* to invest them with Christ Jesus, and clothe them with the Robes of his Righteousness, since no other Sacrifice can, ever did, or was ever designed to atone for Sin, but his; his only being the Robes of Righteousness, and all other but as filthy Rags. If their Body was naked, so was their Soul naked, despoiled of the Glory of God, exposed to divine Vengeance, but covered, clothed and protected by Christ. Hence *Isaiah*, “ (a) Put on thy
 “ Strength, O *Sion*, put on thy beautiful Gar-

(a) Chap. lii. 1.

“ ments, O *Jerusalem*, the holy City.” And *Job* says, “ (a) I put on Righteousness and it “ clothed me.” And *St. Paul* bids us, *put on the Lord Jesus Christ* (b). And many other Places there are to the same Purpose, which as they explain the meaning of the emblematical Act of clothing them, or covering their naked Bodies, so they prove that the Skins made Use of on this Occasion were the Skins of the sacrificed Beasts, the Types of the great Sacrifice. It proves this, I say, because it was not the Nakedness of the *Body* but *Soul* which wanted the Covering, and because no Covering but *Christ's*, no Robes but those which belong to the Sun of Righteousness can communicate spiritual Warmth or Beauty to the inner Man.

This Sort of picturing or Method of expressing the inward Sentiments of the Soul, describing its Wants, its Sense of those Wants, and the Means by which those Wants were to be supplied, by outward external Things such as convey fixed and settled Meanings, were look'd on as beautiful Descriptions, masterly Eloquence, and the most expressive Language; while Men, poor unhappy Creatures! had no Book, but that of Nature to read in, and no other Master but God. Now the World is so much advanced in Learning, and we have made such *noble* and *useful* Improvements in *Metaphysics* and abstracted Reasoning, and have our own Reason, or ourselves for our

(a) Chap. xxix. 14.

(b) Rom. xiii. 14.

Guide, it is Stupidity not to be wise above what is written, and narrow-fouled Ignorance, a mean-spirited Turn of Mind, not to desire a more noble and spacious Field than the Field of God to gather our Knowledge in. The *Metaphysician* is wiser than the *Prophet*, and *Reason* can teach more than *Revelation*. But though we don't expect the *humble Drefs* which the ignorant Ancients dressed up their poor *Scantlings* of Knowledge in, can be entertaining in the Eyes of *modern* Politeness; or that unravelling, or rather unclothing, their Thoughts can be instructive to the vast Scholars of this learned Age, yet it may be an Amusement to examine into what they thought, and consider their Manner of recording their Thoughts and Actions; and it is to be hoped these *great Men* will make such Allowances for the Ignorance and Simplicity of their Fore-fathers, as becomes *great* and *good* Men, who choose rather to *pity*, than *deride* the Weakness of others. *Adam* thought God the best Instructor, and *Eve*, though she was persuaded to set up for herself, was ashamed of it, and gladly returned to her first Guide. And God hath thought proper to describe this Part of their Story by relating such Actions, as they had been taught to express their Thoughts by, and which when examined shew very plainly the Nature of their Condition in Paradise—The Nature of their Trial—The Nature of their Temptation—The Heinousness of their Sin—The Manner of their

confessing it—The Sense of Shame it gave them—The Punishment denounced on them and the Tempter—The new Terms appointed to Man, or the Nature of the second State of Trial—The Manner of the Atonement which was to avert the eternal Death they had subjected themselves to, and the Method made Use of to record the Promise or keep alive the Expectation of his coming, who was to purchase Redemption for them, which they were to lay hold of by the Hand of Faith, and which they were to give outward Proofs of by such *Acts*, as God was pleased to appoint for this Purpose. All this is related as it were in a Picture, to the understanding of which nothing in general is required, but remembering that our Souls are clothed with Bodies, and that what passeth in the Soul is not visible to others, to none but God, except as outward Acts shall by Agreement stand for the Acts of the Mind; and since Words are but Substitutes of *Things* or *Actions*, *Things* and *Actions* must be looked on as the most natural and obvious Conveyances of our inward Sentiments.

Let us now proceed to the next Verse, viz. the twenty second, “ *And the Lord God said* “ *behold Man is become like one of us to know* “ *Good and Evil.*”

“ Man is become like one of us,” an Expression which hath occasioned many Disputes, and which few have satisfied themselves in the Meaning of. The Persons of *Jehovah* say Man was

was become like one of them; was this by Way of Sarcasm or Jest on fallen Man? That were below their Dignity, and the very reverse of that merciful Disposition and over-abundant Goodness, which induced them to receive Man into Pardon and devise a Method to recover him. Is, *one of us* any one in general of the three ever-blessed Persons of the Godhead, or is it one of them in particular? It is true indeed that *one of them*, one, in particular, of the Persons of the eternal uncreated Essence, was by the Oath of the Covenant (and which Covenant is expressed in the Name *God*, and was explained to our first Parents, as appears by Ver. 15.) bound to take human Nature upon him and experimentally to know Good and Evil, among other Things to be subject to Death. And Man was first to die before he could be advanced into Happiness, this was one Part of the Sentence pronounced on him. Here then we see there is a likeness betwixt God and Man; and the Sense of the Words, *Man is become like one of us*, is, by this Interpretation, the same as if it had been said, *One of us is become like Man*. “ Man is now under
 “ a Necessity of experimentally knowing
 “ Good and Evil, of suffering and dying before he can be admitted into Life, so is like
 “ *that one* of us who by the Oath of the Covenant is to (a) take human Nature, the
 “ Form of a Servant upon him, and be made

(a) Phil. ii. 7.

“ in

“ in the likeness of Men, and become obedient unto Death.” This looks plausible, but it is not what *Moses* says, his Words are, that *Man was become like one of the Elahim*, not that *one of the Elahim was become like Man*. And had he meant so, I see no Reason why he might not directly have said it : He would then have but wrote in the same Language that *St. Paul* did, who in the Words above, says, that “ God was made in the likeness of Men. Nor is this Sense of the Words pertinent to the Place, it doth not at all answer the Reason given for what follows, *And the Lord God said, behold the Man is become like one of us to know Good and Evil. And now lest he put forth his Hand, and take also of the Tree of Life, and eat, and live for ever : Therefore the Lord God sent him forth from the Garden of Eden*. Which must then stand thus, “ One of us is under an Obligation to become “ like Man, therefore lest Man eat of the Tree “ of Life and live for ever, let us remove him “ out of the Garden and from that Tree.” In which there is no Connexion betwixt the Reason for the Resolution of removing him, and the Thing guarded against, because God being to be manifest in Flesh, was no Reason why Man should not eat of the Tree of Life, if that would have made him happy. Nay, this is certainly true, that if Man could have been made happy by that, or any other Means, that then God would not have taken our Nature

ture

ture upon him, and consequently his taking our Nature upon him cannot be assigned as a Reason for his being denied the Tree of Life. Besides the Text speaks of what is past, not of what was to come. *Jehovah* was not then incarnate, consequently one of the *Elahim* was not the Exemplar and *Adam* the Copy ; but rather, nay certainly, *Adam* was the Exemplar of that State of Infirmary, Misery, and of that *likeness of Men* which *Jehovah* afterwards took upon him.

But the Expression *one of us* doth not at all confine the Sense to one particular Person of the Trinity, but in general means any one of them ; in the *Psalms*, “ (a) Ye shall die like “ Men, and fall *like one of the Princes*.” Was not at all designed to lead us to any particular Prince whom they were to die like ; nor is this in the Text before us any more, than “ Man “ is become like any one of us, to know as we “ do, like one of us in Knowledge, like God in “ Knowledge.” But that Man was *really* become like a Person of the Godhead is so far from being true, that he was become the very reverse, he had lost the Image of God, and become rather a Devil. To be *like God* was the Temptation which drew him into the Snare, and this is all that is implied by the Words, “ Man hath been so weak and foolish as to “ think it possible to become like one of us, “ capable of knowing without being taught,

(a) lxxxii. 7.

“ that

“ that he may well be suspected of being weak
 “ enough to fall into another no less sinful
 “ and dangerous Error, even of thinking to
 “ make himself for ever happy, without sub-
 “ mitting to the Terms we have now set him,
 “ which since it is absolutely impossible he
 “ should, let us in Mercy take some suitable
 “ Measures to prevent a Relapse so dangerous,
 “ so fatal to his Happiness.” Nor is this Con-
 struction forced, but what the Words naturally
 imply, “ Man hath attempted to make him-
 “ self like one of us,” this carries no Wit, no
 Jest, Jeer or Sarcasm on lost Man, but is
 spoke with the tenderest Regard to his Good,
 the most compassionate Sense of his Distress;
 and attempting or thinking to make themselves
 like God was all they had done. So “ (a) *Eve*
 “ saw that the Tree was a Tree to be desired
 “ to give one Knowledge,” is, she thought, she
 saw, she admitted such an Imagination into
 her Mind. And when God says they had
 made themselves wise or like him, by eating of
 the Fruit of the Tree, no more can be meant
 than what had been really done. And this was
 a sufficient Reason for what follows, since he
 had sinned once, he might again; nay might
 be induced to justify it, he might refuse to sub-
 mit to the Penalty, that is deny it to be just,
 and act as if it was never to be inflicted. He
 could not help dying in Time, but he might
 deny it just or equitable in God to inflict Death

(a) Ver. 6.

upon

upon him, and endeavour to possess himself of *Life*, lay Claim to *Life*, without acknowledging the Forfeiture. And this is what God endeavours to prevent; for should he refuse to submit to this, should the same Folly which had once betrayed him into a Contempt of the Wisdom and Goodness of God, prevail with him to distrust them again, and to attempt eternal Happiness by any Method of his own; in short, should he take it into his Head to say he had not incurred the Penalty of Death, or that the Sin he had committed required no Atonement, he had then sinned beyond Pardon, and must have died eternally, or been damned, there being no further Room for Mercy to those who reject the Offer of Mercy through Christ, or which is the same thing, deny his Death necessary to procure Life.

To prevent *Adam's* Relapse, or falling a second time, God takes him from the Tree of Life, removes him out of the Garden, and sets up the Emblems, Memorials, Records of the new Covenant, that his Eyes might only be fix'd on the latter, without any Thought of being made immortal on other Terms, *Now lest he put forth his Hand, and take also of the Tree of Life, and eat and live for ever; therefore the Lord God sent him forth from the Garden of Eden.*

But was God afraid he should make himself immortal, by eating of the *Tree of Lives*? If that would have done it, why needed there
any

any other Method? And if that would not have done it, why was he removed from it? I answer, it would be as silly to suppose that the Fruit of a Tree could make him immortal, or eternally happy, as that the Fruit of a Tree should make him wise. In this Case, as in the other, putting forth his Hand and taking of the Fruit, was but the outward Act, expressive of the Sentiments of the Mind, an emblematical or sacramental Act, no otherwise significative than as Words or Declarations are, in itself neither good nor bad; what then was it *Adam* must have meant by eating its Fruit? As I said of the other Tree, to whom or what was it dedicated? The Text expresses it by a Word we translate *Life*, but may and often doth signify *Living ones*, those who have Life in themselves, *Lives*. The Fruit of this Tree was *Life* from those Persons. *Eating* is supporting our Bodies by that on which we feed; and eating of the Fruit of the Tree, had been *digesting* the Thought, claiming and convincing himself that his Claim of Life from *them* had been just and reasonable. And where may it be asked had been the Fault in doing so? — It would have been renouncing the new Covenant, claiming Happiness on the old Footing. This Tree and the Garden were the Book of the first Covenant. Types appointed as significative of the spiritual Blessings expected on the first Terms. Returning to them had been denying the Fall, and refusing to

to submit to the Penalty he had incurred, a Sin which could not have been pardoned, as resisting the last Effort of Divine Mercy.

It is true they might have eaten of the Fruit of this Tree, had it not been a sacred one, without any other Design than pleasing their Palates, and then there would have been no Sin in it; for there was no Prohibition against eating its Fruit that we know of, which shews that the Sin would have laid in the Intention with which they had eaten. Nay, this shews evidently that this Tree had been before the Fall instituted by God, consecrated to a religious Use, which *Use* is expressed in the Name given it, and the Intention with which only they could take of its Fruit, is implied in the Name of the Tree also, as well as expressly mentioned by God, *Lest he put forth his Hand and take also of the Tree of Lives, and eat and live for ever.* What, as I said before, doth, or can any one imagine that these Words imply there was a Power in a Tree to communicate Immortality independent of the Will of God? No, that is impossible; eternal Life is not the Gift of any Creature. That which is itself frail and perishable, as all material things are, cannot make any thing else incorruptible and durable to Eternity. Nor did *Adam* want to be made immortal, it was never intended he should be otherwise. There was indeed something to be done before he could be admitted to eternal Life; by eternal Life meaning eternal

nal Happiness, as by Death eternal, we mean everlasting Misery. There was something to be done before he could be admitted to the Enjoyment of those whom the Tree represented, which he could not do for himself; and thinking or endeavouring to possess himself of it before that *something* was done for him, is what it pleased God to make the best Provision possible against. Removing *Adam* and *Eve* out of the Garden and from the Sight of the Tree of Life, was an express and strong Declaration to them that there was no other *Name* given to Man by which he could be saved but that of the promised Seed, who henceforward was to be the (a) *Way*, the *Truth* and the *Life*.

As eating of the Fruit of the Tree of Life could have been no Sin, had it not been an instituted sacred Tree; so *Adam's* Faith might have wavered, and he have fallen into the Sin implied in eating its Fruit, without actually tasting it, and he would have been subject to the same Punishment; because eating the Fruit was but the outward Declaration of the inward Sense of the Mind, the Act of which was what would have given the Disgust. Let others therefore take care of falling into this silly ridiculous Imagination of making themselves immortal, or entitling themselves to eternal Happiness on the Footing of Morality only;

(a) Joh. xiv. 6.

may, though they take in the Duties due to a Creator, whilst they refuse to acknowledge the Mercy of Redemption, for this is the Sin *Adam* was removed from. The pious and learned Physician, *Dr. Smith*, speaking of this Text, says, " He never knew any one touch " but the Foot of this Mount, I mean, says " he, attempt any thing that is but analogous " thereunto, but his Work, if not himself, " was destroyed thereby." A Man in his right Senses must be at a Loss to think what it is can induce Men to imagine they know better than God what will make them happy in another World. What Directions should a Man chuse to follow sooner than those which proceed from infinite Wisdom and the most disinterested Goodness?

That *taking of the Tree of Life and eat and live for ever* means no more than indulge an Imagination of procuring *Life* by it, is I think beyond Dispute, if it be considered that it is only the Act of the Mind which is spoke of, that his taking of its Fruit was to be considered as the outward Declaration of his inward Belief; not a Design to make himself immortal by the Fruit itself, but a Claim to *Life* from those Persons the Tree was sacred to. No sacramental Food ever did, or can, work by way of Charm, and convey the Benefit it exhibits by its own Virtue and Power to the *Receiver*, and yet we say in the Lord's Supper *e. g.* that the Bread and Wine convey

the inward and spiritual Grace; or in the Language of the Text, that the worthy Receivers eat and drink *Salvation* to themselves. And it is just such another Expression as that with regard to *Eve*, which I have once before referred to, when she took of the Fruit of the Tree of Good and Evil. “ (a) The Woman “ saw that the Tree was good for Food, and “ that it was pleasant to the Eyes, and a Tree “ to be desired to make one wife.” She might, it may be said, see the Tree to be good for Food, and pleasant to the Eyes; but it could be no more than Imagination to think it capable of making her wife; so “ she saw “ the Tree—a Tree to be desired to make “ one wife,” is, she thought she saw, or imagined such a Power to be in it, for in it, it was not. So the Words before us, “ and take “ also of the Tree of Life, and live for ever” is, “ and *think* to live for ever,” lest he fall into the sinful Imagination that we shall admit him to Happiness on performing such Obedience as would have entitled him to our Favour before his Fall. And I shall observe farther, that the Words in *English* are much more ambiguous than they are in the *Hebrew*, the very Phraseology * there points out the Sense which I have shewn from other Circum-

(a) Ver. 15.

* *Now lest*, יִשְׁלַח יְדוֹ, *he exert his Power, or endeavour,* is the direct Translation of the Phrase, make an Attempt, and take and eat, and live for ever.

stances

stances to be the Intent of them ; and this convinces me that the other controverted Expression, " Man is become like one of us," doth not mean that Man was really become so, any more than that it was designed as a sarcastical Irony; but in the same Manner as here, " Man hath thought to make himself " like one of us, hath been weak enough to " think such a Perfection acquirable, and " may therefore form any other silly Imagination." This is the Reason given for the next Step it pleased God to take with him, Ver. 23.

Therefore the Lord God sent him forth from the Garden of Eden, and thereby gave him the strongest Declaration of the Nullity of the old Covenant, and in a Manner obliged him to till the Ground from whence he was taken, and work out his Salvation with Fear and Trembling. So he drove out the Man ; and he placed at the East of the Garden of Eden Cherubims, and a flaming Sword.

Commentators lay great Stress on this Particular, that the Cherubim and flaming Sword were placed here *to keep the Way of the Tree of Life* ; I would do so likewise, and think a very great Stress ought to be laid upon it : But *keeping the Way*, or, *keeping a Way*, will admit of two Senses. Doth it mean here that the Cherubim were to stand like Centinels, with a Sword in their Hands, to keep Men from coming to the Tree of Life, which was in the

midst of the Garden? Why then did it not say so? Here is no Mention of the Sword being in their Hands. Why were they not placed in the Center of the Garden where the Tree was, and not at the East of the Garden, leaving an Avenue open, either by the West, North or South! Or if keeping them from eating of the Tree had been all that is meant, destroying of it Root and Branch had absolutely and effectually prevented all Thought or Possibility of their coming at it, without the standing Miracle, or standing Expence of an Angelick Guard, or putting the immortal Spirits to the pitiful Employment of guarding a paltry Tree; for so ridiculous, silly and stupid is the Account which the blind, besotted, malicious, apostate *Jews* have given us of this Matter, whose Authority *alone* hath induced our learned Commentators to palm this stupid Piece of Stupidity upon the World.

If then the *Cherubim* were not placed here by Way of *Guard*, but to *keep* or *preserve* a Way to the Tree of Life, what were the *Cherubim*! What is the Way spoke of! And how did they preserve the Way! These are Questions of great Importance, and which open a large and wide Field. The whole Bible is but an Explanation of what they lead to.

Let us state the Case or Condition *Adam* was now in—He had sinned, forfeited the first Way to Happiness, and subjected himself to Death, but had confessed his Fault, and received

ceived a Promise of Pardon, on the Performance of some Conditions on his Part, the first of which was submitting his Soul and Body, the Powers and Abilities of both, to the Direction and Command of another, who was to conquer his great Enemy for him, and purchase him with the Price of his own Blood; so that other was now the *Way* to the *Tree*, whose *Fruit* was to give him *Life*. The old Way was abrogated, and the first *Type* become ineffectual. His Hopes and Thoughts were transferred to this other, who was promised and fully declared to him; on whom he had placed his Faith, and given sufficient Proof of his having done so. The Way therefore that was now to be preserved to the *Tree*, from whence he was to gather Fruit unto Life eternal, was the Seed of the Woman, God-Man. Among other things, the Translators seem to have been led into an Error here, by not observing that the Tree of Life, the Way to which, the *Cberubim* were to keep, was now restored; for they had received the Promise of *Life*, that he *that overcame should eat of the Tree of Life which is in the midst of the Paradise of God (a)*; and that it was not the Design of God to keep Men from coming to it, that is, from coming to him; but really to put him in the Way to it, in such a Way as would lead him to it, which the old Way

(a) Rev. ii. 7.

could not now have done ; and the Ambiguity of the Expression, “ *to keep the Way*,” confirmed them in the general Mistake of the Design of this Passage. Certainly the same Persons are now to give us Life, which were to have done so before the Fall ; but there is a different *Way* to be taken to come at their Favour, and this *Way* it was which the *Cherubim* were set up to keep. To *keep a Way*, as I said, may be preventing its being trod in ; or it may be *preserving* it as a *Way* to be gone in. As this was the *new Way*, it could not be to prevent Men going in it, and must be to *preserve* it for them. That the *Cherubim* were not Centinels to this Tree, or the *Way* to it, is plain because they were not placed as Centinels, or near enough to be Guards to it, and because it would have been below the Dignity of Angels to have been employ’d, and unworthy the Wisdom of God, to have employed them on so unnecessary and trifling a Business ; and which might have been done with so much less Trouble, and more effectually, by destroying the Tree.

But what were the *Cherubim* ? (a) It hath been generally said they were Angels, created immaterial Spirits. We have no Authority for saying so but the Assertion of the unbelieving *Jews*, “ from whose Heart the Vail is not yet “ taken away in reading the Old Testament.”

(a) See *Glory and Gravity*, p. 94. &c. *Hebrew Writings perfect*, p. 362, &c.

They have called them so without giving *one single Word of Evidence*, and we have had no more Sense than to take *their Word* for it. The Word signifies *a Picture of the Great ones*, being derived from כ a Note of *Likeness*, a *Picture*, and רבים *Great ones*; nor is there any Root in the Tongue we can derive it from besides. The Prophet *Ezekiel*, in the first Verse of his Prophecy, calls them מראות אלהים which we translate *Visions of God*; and that may mean *Visions* which the *Elahim* exhibited to the Prophet of other Persons and Things; but מראות אלהים is more, is *Visions exhibited of the Elahim*, Instruments of seeing the Elahim,—for he saith, Ver. 28. *This was the Appearance of the Likeness of the Glory of the Lord*. And Chap. viii. Ver. 4. *The Glory of the God of Israel according to מראה that I saw in the Plain*. And Chap. x. Ver. 20. *This is תחת אלהים the Creatures which I saw instead of, a Substitute of, the Elahim of Israel, by the River of Chebar, and I knew that they were the Cherubim*. In the first Chapter he describes them at large as a compound Image, consisting of a *Bull*, a *Lion*, a *Man*, and an *Eagle*, united in *one Body*, and the Heads *apart*; only the Lion's Head and that of the Man were joined together, not by *Confusion of Substance*, but *Unity of Persons*, or *Union of Faces*. These Creatures are each *Chiefs* or *Principals*, so not improperly, or rather with great Propriety represent those who are *chief*

or great in all Respects. This Compound Image was placed in the Holy of Holies, which St. Paul says (a) was the Figure of Heaven, or of the Place which is the immediate Residence of God. He says in the same Place, that the Priests going into the Holy of Holies, and sprinkling the Blood of the Sacrifice before the Faces of the Cherubim, was figurative of Christ's Ascension into Heaven, and exhibiting his own Blood to the Face of the Deity. "Christ is not enter'd into the holy Places made with Hands, which are the Figures of the true; but into Heaven itself, now to appear in the Presence of God for us." This single Place of Scripture is an undeniable Proof that the *Cherubim* were an hieroglyphical *Substitute* of God, or Picture representing the Persons of the Deity, to the Sight of Man; because this Image stood on the *Mercy-Seat*, which was in the Holy of Holies, and the Blood of the Sacrifice was sprinkled on the *Mercy-Seat* before their Faces, which they were so placed as to look at; and they do represent the Persons of Jehovah in all the Views you can conceive them concerned in the Redemption of Man. By the Covenant one of the *Elabim* was to take human Nature upon him; this is represented by the *Face* of a Lion, (i. e. the *Person* of him the Lion stood for) joined to the *Face* or *Person* of a Man. *Face* and *Per-*

(a) Heb. ix. 24.

son are synonymous in all Languages, at least was so in hieroglyphical Imagery, and as *Face* is *Person*, so *Body* is *Substance* or *Essence*. Hence this Figure pointed out the Trinity in Unity, as well as Incarnation, by having one joint Body and three Faces distinct or separate from each other. Had the Picture consisted of Men, who are in another View, more lively and more exact Pictures or Image of God, the Incarnation could not have been represented or foretold in it. Had three Lions, or three of any other Beasts, which may be supposed to be better entitled to the Name of *Chiefs* than the others, been made use of on this Occasion, the Distinction of the Person to be incarnate, and of the Parts appropriated to, or undertaken by, the other two Persons, had been lost, which now is preserved with the utmost Exactness and Nicety. The *Bull* being in all Nations the Emblem of *Fire*, as Fire is of *Wrath*; the *Lion* of *Light*, as Light is of *Life*; the *Eagle* of the *Spirit*, which is the Agent that inspires or breaths in us, and keeps the Machine of our Bodies moving. So these *secondary Causes* not only exhibit a Picture of the threefold Personality in *Jehovah*, but describe their peculiar Parts in the Covenant of Grace. The first Person demands Satisfaction for Sin, and by his Emblem *Fire*, devoured the *Sacrifice* the Figure of the Death and Sufferings of Christ. He, the second Person, by his Humanity, fed the Fire till he was consumed,

sumed, and it satisfied; through Death conquers Death, and restores Life to Men; so is the *Life* the *Light* of Men. The Holy Spirit breaths in us, in our Souls, supports and keeps up our spiritual Life.

Thus if you ransack the whole Compass of Nature, nothing will be found so exact and proper a Figure or Picture of the Persons of the Trinity acting their several Parts in the Recovery of lost Man, as this was. The Unity of the *Essence* by the Union of the Body of these Creatures, for they had but one Body; the Distinction of the *Persons* in the Deity, by their *Faces* being disunited; the personal Union of one of them, *viz.* the second Person, by uniting the *Faces* of the Lion and Man. These Faces were so placed, as to look on the Mercy-Seat, where the Blood of the Sacrifice was sprinkled, so looked at or regarded the Blood of Christ. There are many other Particulars, all strictly and exactly applicable to, or rather descriptive of, the Persons concern'd in, and of the Means of our Redemption. What I have mentioned is more than enough to shew what, in general, was meant by the Cherubim; and how they *preserved* or *kept the Way*, the new Way, *to the Tree of Lives*.

They brought or represented to Sense nothing less than *the eternal uncreated Three*, and the Covenant which they had sworn to perform in the Behalf and for the Benefit of Man. And might well be appointed *to keep the Way of the Tree*

Tree of Lives, since they *were* and *are* such indisputable Records of the Covenant of Grace ; and either in direct, *Figures*, Words, I was going to say, or by obvious Consequence contain the whole of Christianity. The Part of God and Man. Hereby keeping alive the Knowledge of Christ, Faith in him, and the Hopes and Expectation of his Appearance, which he must once more make, before what was represented there will be compleated. They preserved the Knowledge of him who is the Way we are to walk in, and directed our first Parents and their Posterity in the Path which led to Heaven. And the Secret is out, why the *Jews* who deny Christ, have told us such a monstrous Number of Lies about them.

The *flaming Sword*, or rather as I should take it, the *flaming Fire* which was an Appendage to the Figure, was very correspondent to the Design in Hand ; because a Person was to be cut off, the *Fire* or the *Sword* was to feed on the Sacrifice, on Christ.

And *changing itself*, because that was to change the Scene from Death to Life, to Glory and Immortality. Whether it was a *Sword* or *Fire* matters not a great deal, both are expressive enough of *cutting off*, of *Wrath*, or the Instrument by which the Sacrifice was made to undergo the Wrath (a). Whether I say, *את להט החרב* be a *Sword* or *Fire burning*, I shall not contend ; but *המתהפכת* by no Means

(a) See some Thoughts upon Religion, &c. p. 90. & seq.
signifies

signifies *turning every way*; nor is it a *Participle* but a *Noun Substantive*. הפך is to change the Condition of any Thing from better to worse, or from worse to better, simply, *to change*. התהפך in *Hithpael*, is *changing itself*. מתהפכת is having the *Power* or *Means* of changing itself. And such the *Wrath* had, when it had consumed the Sacrifice. This changed *Justice* into *Mercy*. The בעל חמה, as the Prophet *Nabum* describes *God the Father*, whose *Wrath* was poured out like *Fire*, was to be appeased when the *Fire* had burnt up the Sacrifice; so להט החרב המתהפכת, is, The burning *Fire* with a *Power* of changing its own Condition.

Our *English* says, *God* placed this hieroglyphical Picture or Imagery at the East of the Garden, but the *Original* says more, that the Divine Presence attended or *dwelt in it*; thereby made it the *Oracle*, and fixed it for a Place of Worship, which was establishing a *Church Service*. Hence it appears that the *Law* was now revealed, that is, immediately on, or after the Fall. And that here was the Rise of Image Worship among the Heathens of their Household Gods, sacred Images, and Hieroglyphics of all Sorts. All which the higher you rise in Antiquity, the nearer you find them to the *Truth* and common Sense, more consistent with themselves, the more used and the better understood.

When

When it appears that hieroglyphical Learning, or sacred Imagery, Emblems, emblematical Actions, Rites and Ceremonies arose from Revelation, and that Mankind received *them* and their *Blood* from one common Stock, from the first Man; and that this is so plainly asserted in Scripture, and so consonant to History both sacred and prophane, one can't but wonder that learned Men should pretend to be at a Loss to account for that Conformity of Manners, Customs, and the external Church Service of *Believers* and *Unbelievers*, from the first to the last; as also for that Conformity of the Religion of the *Patriarchs* and *Jews*: And instead of wondring that a few leading Men should have the Knowledge of the true God and his Salvation, the Surprise is, that all Mankind had it not, for one would have thought a Church Service so constituted, would have preserved the Truth in spite of the Devil and all his Agents. *What could have been done more to the Vineyard than was done in it*, is the Expostulation of God by the Prophet *Isaiab*, (a) and yet *instead of good Grapes, it brought forth wild ones*. In a few Years they made a Revolt to the *secondary Causes*. And there was something easy in the Transition; *Sense* carries it against *Faith* too commonly; and this was the Case with *Eve* at first, and soon after with the Generality; and when the Defection became general, the Curse long since decreed

(a) Chap. v. 4.

on the Earth was executed, and the World destroyed by the Flood; *Noah* only and his Family being preserved, because he persisted in the right Faith. Notwithstanding this terrible Example of God's Vengeance on those who corrupted *their Way before him*, in a few Years after the Flood, they made a second Revolt, and their Crime is described at large; but still there was a Church of God, with all the Appendages of divine Service, Priest, Sacrifice, Cherubim and Prophets, which continued till *Moses's Time*.

They who have imagined that the *religious Ritual*, which we have that punctual Account of in the *written Law*, arose first from meer Imagination, or never thought at all about its Origin, must necessarily have confused or wrong Notions about these Matters. They will naturally think there was no divinely established Form of Worship till *Moses's Time*. And when they find the most material Parts of the external Form of Religion which he gave the *Jews* in Practice among all other Nations long before, will think that God borrowed them from them for the Use of his own People, and such a false Position will run them into many more, and the more, the more they endeavour to account for Things. Whereas if they received the *Ritual* from *Adam*, and he had it from God; the Ceremonies it contained could never be entirely lost; *Adam* would teach it his Children; they, theirs and so on.

And

And how unlikely is it that this Service should be neglected by the Heads of the Family, who were *Ministers* in it and most of them Prophets? *Methuselah* was above two hundred and forty Years old, when *Adam* died, and *Noah* a hundred when *Methuselah* died, and *Abraham* betwixt fifty and sixty when *Noah* died, and *Jacob* betwixt twenty and thirty when *Abraham* died. Thus improbable doth it appear at first View, either that the Church Service established by divine Authority should be lost; or that the Church should forget so soon as *Moses's* Time what they were to worship God for. So far from that, that till the Days of *Peleg*, and after the Birth of *Abraham*, all Mankind, the whole Earth, *Gen. xi. 1.* had the same שפה *Confession*, and דברים אחרים, the same *Mysteries* in Rites and Ceremonies. They acknowledged the same God, worship'd upon the same Hopes, and had the same outward Form. דברים is applied to the Sacrifices by *Jeremiah*, (a) *I spake not to their Fathers, nor commanded them in the Day I brought them out of the Land of Ægypt, concerning דברים (Mar. the Matter) of burnt Offerings and Sacrifice.* Which shews what the דברים אחרים were which all the Earth had, when the Heirs of the disinherited Family of *Ham*, set up a new God, the שמים the *secondary Agents*, and built a Temple to them, in order

(a) vii. 22. See new Account of Confusion of Tongues by J. H.

to secure to themselves the Honours, Profits and Privileges annexed to the *Birth-right*, and which they enjoyed, who by Virtue of it exercised *civil* and *spiritual* Power.

The Rev. Mr. *Warburton* hath projected a Plan to *demonstrate the Divine Legation of Moses upon his Omission of the Doctrine of a future State in his Writings*. Whether that Use could be made of the Omission of this Doctrine, supposing it omitted there, let others judge. The Gentleman himself seems to think great Advantage would arise from it to the Service of Religion; and exults upon the Honour of bringing to Observation the important Truth: I must own I am so far from agreeing with the learned Gentleman in his Sentiments on this Head, that I think it would be no hard Matter for the Deist to turn the Argument upon us, and use it to destroy the Authority of both Testaments: To instance in one Particular.—Mr. *Warburton* hath brought the (as I suppose he took them to be) *positive Assertions* of Prophets and inspired Men in the Old Testament, that there was not a future State—The Prophets and inspired Men in the New Testament *as positively assert* there is. Is not this making *the Old Testament contrary to the New*, and destroying the Authority of both? Let Mr. *Warburton* himself judge. To say *Moses* hath omitted the Doctrine is one Thing, to say he or any other inspired Writer hath denied it, is another. This latter Mr.

War-

Warburton hath asserted over and over again that *inspired Men* have denied there was a future State; which is directly setting Prophet against Prophet, and Testament against Testament.

It is the third Proposition of Mr. *Warburton's Demonstration* of *D. L.* and what he had brought to support it, that I propose to consider—The Proposition is this,

“ That the Doctrine of a future State of Rewards and Punishments is not to be found in, nor did make part of the Mosaic Dispensation (a). ”

The Proof of this Proposition, (that is what he calls so) we have Vol. II. Part 2. A Consideration of what the *Cberubim* was, and the Intent of setting them up, is alone sufficient to shew how strangely the Gentleman hath mistaken the State of the Case; as he has likewise, the difference betwixt the *Doctrine*, and *Gift*, of eternal Happiness, throughout his whole Argument. But to the Question, whether the *Types* taught a future State.

The *Cberubim* and *Ark* they stood upon, have always been esteemed as the Fundamentum, Radix, Cor & Medulla totius Tabernaculi, atque adeo totius Cultus Levitici (b), and by *Scripture* we learn that they were of this Consequence and Importance, which I must desire the Reader to take particular notice of,

(a) Div. Leg. Part. 1. p. 7.
Arcæ Fœderis, p. 151.

(b) See *Buxt. Hist.*

because they will be of admirable Service to us in proving, that the Hopes and Expectation of eternal Life were to be learnt from the *Types*.

Their general Design hath been already considered and proved from those Words of *Moses*, that they were, לשמר את דרך עץ החיים, *to preserve a Way to the Tree of Lives*. If it were the *typical Tree* they were to have kept the Way to, what were they placed in the Tabernacle and Temple for? There was no Tree growing there. And I mention this again to shew the Connexion betwixt them and the *Law*, because if *they were to preserve a Way to Life*, and the whole *Law* centered in them, as I shall shew it did, then we prove the early Institution of the *Law*, and that they who had the one, had the other also; and that they who understood the one, must understand the other.

The *Cherubim* (a) were made out of the same Piece of Gold with the *Mercy-Seat*, which was the Covering of the *Ark*, and the *Ark* with its Furniture was placed in the *Holy of Holies*. The Blood of the Sacrifice was to be sprinkled upon the *Mercy-Seat*, which the Faces of the *Cherubim* were to regard—*towards the Mercy-Seat shall the Faces of the Cherubim be—He (b) shall take of the Blood of the Bullock and sprinkle it upon the Mercy-Seat*, which shews that these *Figures* were called פני ידוה, because the Atonement is said to be made לפני ידוה, by sprinkling the Blood

(a) Exod. xxv. 9—21.

(b) Lev. xvi. 14.

upon

upon the *Mercy-Seat*. Compare together Lev. x. 17.—*to make an Atonement for them לפני יהוה*—and the two Texts last cited, with what St. Paul says, *(a) Christ is not entered into the Holy Places made with Hands, the Figures of the true, but into Heaven itself, now to appear in the Presence of God for us.* In Isaiah, Chap. xxxvii. 14. *Hezekiah received the Letter from the Hand of the Messengers—went up to the House of the Lord and spread it לפני יהוה, and prayed, saying, O Lord of Hosts, God of Israel, ישב הכרובים that inhabits the Cherubim.* Which shews that the *Cherubim* were the *Presence of Jehovah*, he spread the Letter to. A Proof to the same Purpose arises from comparing two other Texts together. “ *(b) I will commune with thee from above the Mercy-Seat, from between the two Cherubims—Moses went in לפני יהוה to speak with him.* By which we learn that it was the *Faces or Persons* of *Jehovah*, the *Cherubim* were to represent; and that the Jews knew it, because their own Text says it. *Cherubim* were engraved upon the Doors of the Temple, and upon the Walls; but the *פני יהוה* to which the Atonement was made were in the *Holy Places made with Hands, the Figures of the true.* And if the Reader will take notice that the *Cherubim* were *פני יהוה* the *visible Presence of God*, the Connexion betwixt them and the *Law*, and the Importance they were of, and the Light they give to the Intent

(a) Heb. ix. 24.

(b) Exod. xxv. 22. and xxxiv. 34.

of the Sacrifices, will appear from a very few Considerations — The Blood could not *atone* unless sprinkled before their Faces (a). And it was Death for the Priest to come before them without Blood to sprinkle (b). Hence the Atonement could not be made without them; so their Church-Service was imperfect where these *Figures* were wanting — The setting up these *Figures* implies, that all the other fundamental Parts or Ceremonies of the *Law* were observed likewise, because it was all necessarily previous to what was done before their Faces.

The *Cherubim* supposes there was an *Ark*, for they stood upon the *Ark*. That supposes there was a *Mercy-Seat*, *Propitiator* or *Coverer*, as כִּפֹּרֶת signifies, for that was the Lid of the *Ark*. That supposes there was a *Tent*, called the *Holy Place of the Holy Ones*, in which the *Ark* was placed. That, again, supposes there was a Priest to go in with Blood to sprinkle to the Faces of the *Cherubim* on the *Mercy-Seat*; for that was one Use of the *Mercy-Seat*, and the Intent of placing the *Cherubim* over it, so as to regard the sprinkling of the Blood.

If there was an *Holy of Holies*, there must be an *Holy Place* or *Tabernacle*, because through that was the Way to the *Holy of Holies*, and if there was an *Holy Place*, there must have been an *Altar*, *Shew-Bread*, *Candlestick*, &c. which

(a) Lev. xvi. 14.

(b) xvi. 2, 3.

the *Holy Place* was made for. What was done in the *Holy Place*, the preparatory Washings, Dress to go into it, eating particular Parts of the Sacrifice there, setting out the Shew-Bread, lighting up the Lights, bringing the Sacrifice to the Door, laying their Hands upon it, killing it there, carrying it out and burning it without the Gate, and many other Particulars which were essential to a *Sacrifice*, will take in almost all the Circumstances in the written *Law*; and this shews they had such *Statutes and Judgments* because they had such Persons and Places as they were performed in and by. Thus by a fair Induction of Particulars from the mention of this one grand Article, it appears they had the rest. They could not have the *Cherubim* without the *Mercy-Seat*, the *Ark*, the *House*, the *Priest*, *Blood*, *Sacrifice*, and *Incense* which the *Priest* at Peril of his Life was to *sume* when he went in to sprinkle the Blood; and having them, implied they used them. This was by divine Institution, for God placed them there. This was all prior to the Sacrifices of *Cain* and *Abel*.

I might run through the same Proof from a Consideration of *Abel's* Sacrifice.

He brought *an Offering to the Lord of the Firstlings of his Flock and of the Fat thereof*.— So there was a Priest, Altar, Holy Place, Holy of Holies, Ark, Mercy-Seat, Cherubim, appointed Time, Motive to Sacrifice, Atonement made, accepted; consequently an Institution,

tution, or Authority for what he did, which must be from God, as that of the *Cherubim* was.

It thus appearing that the *Law* or *religious* Ritual was instituted at first, or soon after the *Fall*, if it doth not already, a little Consideration will soon make it appear, that there is not the least Shadow of a Pretence to suppose *Adam* did not know for what Intent it was instituted. I am at Liberty to argue from the written *Law*, and the Reasons which it gives of the particular Ceremonies or Branches of the *Law*, because I have proved they were for Sum and Substance the same. I have cited but a few Texts, nor shall cite many to prove any Point: Many may confound and a few are sufficient to convince any Reader who allows the Word of God to be decisive.

Adam had the *Law* given him.—The Question, it seems, is whether he understood it. In the first Place, the Time and Occasion of its Institution make it more than probable that he did understand it. It was given him upon his Fall, just after the Promise that *the Seed of the Woman should bruise the Serpent's Head*.—He knew what the Penalty was he had incurred, he knew also that *Sacrifice* was to acquit him of that Penalty, atone for his Sin and restore him to what he had lost. That *he was made for Immortality*, I think is not denied; that he knew *he was so*, is implied very plainly in that *Death* was threatned upon his

his Disobedience, "*in the Day thou eatest thereof thou shalt surely die,*" then he was not to have died if he had not eaten, and consequently knew he was made for Immortality. The Reader must excuse me if I go about to prove what is almost as plain as that two and two make four. We are called upon to do it. And from the Words above, every Person who had the Book of *Genesis* knew Man was at first designed for an eternal Life, and that *Adam* had forfeited eternal Happiness by his Transgression. It was *Life* *Adam* had forfeited. That he was to die *here* notwithstanding his Pardon, he either knew at first or soon after did. Experience put that Matter quickly out of Dispute. What then was it the Promised-Seed was to do for him? It is expressed "*by bruising the Head of the Serpent.*" I have observ'd it, and shall repeat it, that these short Expressions were not all that passed; nor were the Hints of this Kind recorded to make us think that Men knew no more than what is simply contained in the Words, but are mentioned to shew us that the Church of old was acquainted with the Subjects the Hints relate to, it being absurd to suppose that God would talk to People in a Language they did not understand, or that they did not understand what he said to them. *Adam* then knew the Seed of the Woman was to abolish Death, or atone for Sin, and restore him to Life. By the *Law* he was taught that with-

out shedding of Blood there could be no Remission of Sin, and that the Blood was (a) כפר לנפש, not to avert *temporal Death*, because he knew he was to die here, therefore it was to restore Life after Death, *to atone for his Body*, for so נפש signifies; and כפר is to *cover, protect, or screen from Justice*; and the Institution of the *Law*, in express Words, was designed *to keep a Way to Life*. This put together, and it is plain he knew both that *Sacrifice* was a *Type* of the great *Atonement*, and that he was to be raised again to *Life*. The Promise to him was, that the Seed of the Woman should *atone for his Body*, and yet at the same time he sheds the Blood of an innocent Creature to make the Atonement, therefore must know that the *latter* was a Figure or Shadow of the *former*, and could perform *the one* only as an Evidence of his Faith in the other, and as an Exhibition or Representation of it.

Adam, or Abel suppose, brings the Firstlings of his Flock, and makes a Sacrifice to God: Can it be supposed he did not know why he did so? He knew his Life was forfeited, and was bid to shed the Blood of a Brute to make an Atonement for himself. Suppose now that God had done no more than instruct him in the Circumstances or Manner of sacrificing, and left him to guess at the Reason, or put together the *Type* and *Antitype*, that is, had

(a) Lev. xviii. 11.

not told him that the one was a Type of the other, would not the least Consideration in the World have opened the whole Secret to him? I here suppose he knew *the Seed of the Woman was to bruise the Serpent's Head*, because the Text expressly says God had revealed this to them, and that they knew what the Expression meant or related to, because it is inconsistent with the Wisdom and Goodness of God, nay an absolute Contradiction to common Sense, to say that God talked to them without making them understand him; for though the Words are directed to the Serpent, yet it was for their Use, and ours, they were spoke and recorded. And if it could be supposed he did not understand what *bruising the Serpent's Head* meant; yet he could not but understand what *preserving a Way to the Tree of Life* meant. He had been used to that Expression, *the Tree of Life*, and knew the *Tree* was a Substitute of that *Essence*, or those *Persons*, who have *Life* inherent in themselves; and keeping a Way for him into their Presence after Death, implied his Body should be restored to Life.

The Priest now stands before his Sacrifice, and considers what he is doing. " I have
 " forfeited my Life, and God hath revealed
 " to me that the Seed of the Woman shall
 " bruise the Serpent's Head; which Promise,
 " if it means any thing, is, that somebody
 " born of a Woman shall take off the Curse
 " the

“ the Serpent’s Temptation hath subjected us
 “ to. Why do I then shed the Blood of this
 “ innocent Creature? If I can’t make an
 “ Atonement for myself, much less can a
 “ Beast do it. If Man can’t pay the Ransom
 “ for Man, the Life of a Brute is certainly an
 “ insufficient Payment. What I am now
 “ doing hath not so much as the *Image*, only
 “ the *Shadow* of the good things we lost by
 “ the *Fall*, and which we have received a Pro-
 “ mise to be restored to. I carry this Blood
 “ into the Holy of Holies, and sprinkle it be-
 “ fore the Faces which are a Picture of the
 “ Persons of the Deity, and of the God-
 “ Man, for them to regard or look at; but
 “ will they regard the Blood of Bulls and
 “ Goats, while with Anger they turn their
 “ Eyes from that of Men? This Blood then
 “ can be but a Shadow or Type of the Blood
 “ which is to atone; this Sacrifice of a suf-
 “ ficient Sacrifice, and I the Priest of a good
 “ Priest to come. As the Cherubim are an
 “ Image of the Persons of *Jehovah*, and the
 “ Place they are in a Picture of Heaven, it is
 “ plain that a better Priest is to carry better
 “ Blood into the real Presence of God, unless
 “ I am to think that this Image of Gold is my
 “ God, and this Place the Place of their Habi-
 “ tation. But we know better than that; he
 “ hath often manifested himself to us, and
 “ has no *Body* or *Parts*. This Image then can
 “ be but a Representation, and this Place but

" a Type of Heaven, and consequently my
 " coming in here, and exhibiting the Blood
 " to these Faces is of Course but *typical*, as
 " it is also an Evidence that Heaven is to be
 " enter'd by Man, but that the Way to it is
 " through Blood." How obvious is this Reasoning, and how natural the Deductions! It is so very obvious, that it seems Impertinence to the last Degree to enlarge upon it. State but the Case with regard to any Person, whose Sacrifice God accepted, and there will not be the least Doubt but that he knew it was a Type, and offered it as such. Suppose any Man acquainted with the Fall, that Man was not to have died, if he had not sinned, as we are told in Words plain enough, and a very little Candour, and as little Reasoning, will enable him to see through the Shadow, without being told it was such. But they were *really* told so, and that in *numberless* Places, in almost every Verse of the Bible where the *Type* is mentioned, the *Names* given to the *Types* tell them so; and it is told many other Ways. The general Names of the *Sacrifices* shew they were but Representatives — שלם — עון — חטא —
 — עזאזל — ברית — קשט — Sin — Trespass — Perfection — The strong one that delivers — Purifier — Truth, and the like, imply *Qualities* which neither were, nor can be in dumb Creatures, nor some of them in any *meer* Man.

Every thing that was done, almost every thing however was for a *Memorial* of something

thing farther. *Exod. xxx. 12—16.* “Thou shalt take the Atonement-Money of the Children of *Israel*, and shalt appoint it for the Service of the Tabernacle of the Congregation; that it may be לִבְנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל לזִכְרוֹן לפני יְהוָה to the Children of *Israel* for a Memorial before the Lord.” So the Atonement-Money was but a *Memorial*, a Type, made in Memory of the *Ransom*, which was to be paid for them, and they are told so. I have cited *Lev. x. 17.* where the Sin-offering is given to the Priest, “to bear the Iniquity of the Congregation, and to make Atonement for them to the Persons of Jehovah.” The Blood is what made the Atonement, (a) It is Blood that maketh Atonement לְנֶפֶשׁ for the Body, or for Life;” but it was only as a *Memorial*, for in every Sacrifice there was something to be for a *Memorial*. (b) The Priest shall burn אֹתָהּ אֵת it a *Memorial* upon the Altar, an Offering made by Fire, of a sweet Savour to Jehovah.” (c) Shall burn it upon the Altar, for a sweet Savour, a Memorial unto the Lord.” The *English* is much stronger here, or plainer if possible than the Original—*A sweet Savour, even the Memorial of it unto the Lord.* These Texts shew that what was burnt upon the Altar for a *sweet Savour* was for a *Memorial*; and consequently the other Sacrifices were so likewise,

(a) *Lev. xvii. 11.* (b) *ii. 2.* (c) *vi. 15.*

because Parts of them were burnt for a
 “ (a) sweet Savour, an Offering made by Fire
 “ unto the Lord.” And they knew it because
 their own Text says it.

The Shew-Bread was a (b) *Memorial*, and
 that a *Memorial* of the *Support*, or of that
Bread which was to be in him, whom the
Tabernacle represented, and which is to be
 communicated to those who, in Christ, shall
 enjoy the Presence of God hereafter; therefore
 it is called in short, *Presence-Bread*.

Aaron the Priest was to bear the Names of
 the twelve Tribes on his Breast for a *Memorial*
 לפני יהוה — “ Aaron shall bear their Names
 “ לפני יהוה, upon his two Shoulders for a
 “ *Memorial*.” “ And Aaron shall bear
 “ the Names of the Children of *Israel*—
 “ when he goes into the Holy Place, for a
 “ *Memorial* to the *Persons* of *Jehovah* con-
 “ tinually.” Bearing the Names was bearing
 or carrying the People לפני יהוה, into the Pre-
 sence of God, into Heaven; for the לפני יהוה
 were in the Holy of Holies, the Type of Hea-
 ven; and the People knew it, because קדש
 קדשים is the *Holy Place of the Holy ones*. They
 knew that כרבים were a Picture of the Per-
 sons of the Deity, because the Word signifies
 so, and because the Text often calls them
 לפני יהוה. The Consequence that the People
 knew what the Priest carried them in there

(a) Lev. iii. 3—5.

(b) xxiv. 7.

for, is too plain to be disputed. It is true the Apostate *Jews* have cast a Vail over the *Hebrew* Tongue, which Vail will *stretch* to any thing, and have made *Hebrew* the most *ductile*, vague, uncertain Language in the World, in the Opinion of those who don't distinguish the one from the other. And they who will, in spite of common Sense, adhere to the Rules of Grammar, and Interpretation of the Words given by these Brutes, will never find the Sense and Meaning of Scripture, or be able to read and explain it to others. It will always appear to such Men a confused Heap of unintelligible Jargon; and while they think they are laughing at those who do study the *Hebrew itself*, are really exposing their own Ignorance, and making themselves a Jest in earnest. Fling aside that Heap of Rubbish the besotted, stupid, hardened Apostates have thrown upon the *Hebrew*, and it will appear in its native Lustre as *fixed* as an Adamant, and as full of Light. I have now the Happiness to deal with a Man of *great Reading* and *extensive Genius*, who I dare say will think it beneath him to rest the Dispute upon the bare Authority of any Man, or Number of Men, but will try it by the *Hebrew* itself; and if I give a wrong Interpretation of any *Hebrew Word* or *Sentence*, will confute me by the natural Rules of the Language, and Authorities fetch'd from Scripture—He hath shewn himself so great a Lover of Languages, that if

he hath not already, I dare say he will not think his Pains ill bestowed, if he adds the Knowledge of this to the rest. It may possibly alter his present Sentiments in some Particulars, and convince him that, “ (a) groping “ a Way in the dark, through the thick “ Confusion of irrational Religions, and mad “ Schemes of Heathen Philosophy,” will bewilder any Man who hath not the inspired Light in his Hands.—But to proceed to another Particular of the Law, which we shall find carries its Meaning in its Face—The People’s laying their Hand upon the Head of the Sacrifice—“ *He (b) shall lay his Hand upon “ the Head of his Offering.*” This was “ *put- “ ting (c) all their Transgressions and all their “ Sins upon the Head of the Sacrifice.*” Was this then supposing that the Sacrifice could bear their Sin, or take away the Guilt? No, because they were to rest their Hands on the Head of the Priest, and so put their *Sins* on him. And did they think that he was to bear their Sins for them? No, by no Means; they saw the Priest lay his Hands upon the Head of the Sacrifice likewise, and then make an Atonement first for himself, and afterwards for all the People; which Atonement was for a *Memorial*; consequently both the *Priest* and *People shewed* they looked farther than the Type; and that the Priest did not act in his

(a) Divine Leg. Part i. p. 442. (b) Lev. iii. 2. (c) xvi. 21.

own Name, was told the People by *Moses*, *Deut. x. 8. xviii. 5, 7, &c.* “ *Jehovah* separated the Tribe of *Levi*—to stand before “ *Jehovah*, to minister unto him, and to bless “ *in his Name*—to stand to minister *in the* “ *Name of Jehovah.*” Then the People must know that when they laid their Sins on the Priest, they laid them on *Jehovah*, in whose Name the Priest minister’d. It was on the Head of the Priest they laid their Sin, such the real High-Priest was and is. On the Head of the Priest was a *Flower*, an Emblem of *Light*, made of Gold, the Emblem of *Royalty*, and an Inscription *קדש ליהוה* which is equivalent to that Title of Christ in the New-Testament, *the Holy one of God*, and applies it to that Person in *Jehovah*, whose distinguishing Title is *Light*, by placing it upon the known Emblem of *Light*.

The *Tabernacle*, and afterwards the *Temple*, or that particular Part of it which was divided by a Vail from the Holy of Holies, we say was the Humanity of Christ, through which the Way, or Passage, lay to the Holy of Holies, as it doth through Christ, to Heaven. Its Name *קדש*, which is a *Masculine Noun*, implies it was a Type, and they knew so, if they knew their own Language, supposing I mean that *Holy One* is the Construction of the Word, if it is not, this Gentleman will set me right. But not only the Name, the Use of the *Tabernacle* shewed it was a Type—It was
built

built for a dwelling Place for the Name *Jehovah*. It is well known that *The Name Jehovah* is that particular Person of *Jehovah*, who took our Nature upon him, The Tabernacle was the Figure of what he resided in on Earth.

“(a) Let them make me a Sanctuary, that I may dwell among them.” “(b) Unto the Place which *Jehovah* your *Elahim* shall choose, to put *his Name* there, even unto his Habitation shall ye seek.” “(c) To cause *his Name* to dwell there.” “(d) I *Jehovah* dwell among the Children of *Israel*.” And if it should be said that these Passages are not determinate enough of themselves, to prove that a Person of *Jehovah* was to *tabernacle* among us, as St. *John* expresses it (“(e) *The Word was made Flesh, and εσκατωσεν tabernacled among us.*”) yet to them who had the *Cherubim*, and saw a Man united to the Lion, the Emblem of *Light*, the eternal Light in it, there could be no Dispute about the Matter. The קדש was divided by a Vail from the קדש קדשים, in the latter were placed the פני יהוה, which are said to dwell there; but it is not said that more Persons than one dwelt in the other, only שם יהוה and oftentimes *Jehovah*, without any additional Title, which marked out the Distinction plain enough, and shewed it to be (f) אהל שכן בארם “*The*

(a) Exod. xxv. 8. (b) Deut. xii. 5. (c) Ver. 11. (d) xxxv. 34. (e) John i. 14. (f) Psal. lxxviii. 63.

" *Tabernacle of the Dweller in Man*," as the *Psalmist* calls the *typical Tabernacle*, describing it in such Words as are strictly applicable to the *Antitype*. At the erecting this Tabernacle, so at dedicating the Temple, the (a) Cloud abode thereon, and the Glory of *Jehovah* filled it. So the *Spirit* was on Christ, and the real Glory, or the Glory *Jehovah*, an appropriated Title of the second Person, dwelt in him, and filled the Humanity. That God did really design the *Tabernacle*, or what we translate the *Holy Place*, as a Type of the Place in which a Person of the Deity was *indeed to reside on Earth*, is granted; that the Tabernacle had this *spiritual* meaning, I say, is out of Dispute, whether the Body of the People knew it is the only Question betwixt Mr. *Warburton* and his Adversaries. That it was designed as such, our Lord's own Words shew; and that they did, or ought to have known it, appears in the same Place. " (b) Destroy this Temple, " and in three Days I will raise it up.—He " spake of the Temple of his Body. When " therefore he was risen from the dead, his " Disciples remember'd that he had said this " unto them: And they *believed the Scripture*." The Scripture then had given sufficient Intimation that the Temple was his Body, otherwise they could not have believed the Scripture about it, nor would our Lord have spoke of

(a) Exod. xl. 35.

(b) Joh. ii. 19.—22.

his Body by its *typical Name*, had not the Temple had this *spiritual* Meaning. And whatever spiritual Interpretation the *Jews* might at this Time put on the *Law*, it is pretty certain they had forgot that the *Temple*, the *Priest*, and the *Sacrifice*, were the same Person; and yet it is very plain that our Lord, by calling the Temple his Body, without any formal Explanation or Preface, thought they might, as his Disciples afterwards did, have gathered it from the Scriptures. The Incarnation was plainly and clearly shewn in the *Cherubim*. And I must see better Reasons than have been offered as yet, to make me think they did not understand what they saw. St. Paul says they did, if I understand him. “ (a) Into the second (Tabernacle) went the High Priest once every Year, not without Blood—the Holy Ghost this signifying, that the Way into the Holiest of all, was not yet made manifest while the *first Tabernacle* was yet standing, which was a *Figure for the Time then present*.” Then it was signified to the *Jews* who had that Tabernacle, and by *Moses* who instituted it, that there was to be a Way made manifest through another Tabernacle, into the Holiest of all; and the Priest carrying the Blood into “ (b) the holy Places made with Hands, the Figures of the true holy Places,” was a Figure to the Time then present, that

(a) Heb. ix. 7.

(b) Ver. 24.

Christ should carry his own Blood *into Heaven itself*. But if they did not understand it, it was no Figure to them. (a) The Apostle calls Christ “ *a Minister of the Sanctuary, and of the true Tabernacle which the Lord pitched, and not Man*. And the Law calls it the *Holy One*, and says it was built for an Habitation for the *Name Jehovah*. Every Thing which was in the Tabernacle, and every Thing that was done to it, or done in it, would each separately prove that this was but a Type, and that they knew it; but what is said already is sufficient, it not being my Design to explain the Types, but only to shew that People once understood them; though I am persuaded the chief Reason which induceth so many People now a-days to say the *Jews* did not understand them, is, their not understanding them themselves: He that doth understand what the Types meant, will with Scorn reject a Position that says the Church of God under the *Law* did not. I must beg of this Gentleman to examine, *The Use of Reason recovered by the Data in Christianity*, in two Parts, a Treatise wrote by the late Mr. *Hutchinson*, with some Things in his *Glory or Gravity* and his *Hebrew Writings perfect*, and I dare say he will be convinced. I shall beg Leave to transcribe a Page out of the first.

“ (b) The Institution of these Types are so self-evident, that if there had been none,

(a) Heb. viii. 2.

(b) Use of Reason, Part I. p. 294.

“ but

“ but that the utmost Wisdom of all Men in
 “ the fallen State had been left to represent
 “ by material Things and Actions what they
 “ wanted, and that they should have had those
 “ spiritually, which they represented by mate-
 “ rial Things; they could never have thought
 “ of asking what is granted. If we take it
 “ even in that sensible View, whatever wash-
 “ ing by Water represented; The Blood or
 “ Flesh of Animals, Fruits, Juices, Gums,
 “ &c. used in Sacrifice, *which were tempo-*
 “ *rally* for supporting or preserving the Life, or
 “ for curing the Bites or Wounds from malig-
 “ nant Creatures, *were to be spiritually* in, and
 “ transferred to them from Christ. The *Is-*
 “ *raelites* were by Covenant to offer the cor-
 “ poreal Things, typically appointed, to
 “ shadow the real Things which they wanted
 “ spiritually, and which they hoped and be-
 “ lieved Christ by his Sacrifice, &c. would
 “ really procure for them. Gave a perfect
 “ Creature, that his Perfections might be com-
 “ municated to them; gave its Life, to pro-
 “ cure them Life; burned it, to procure Suf-
 “ ferings for their Sins; offered Bread, that
 “ they might have Support from him; Oil, that
 “ that they might partake of his Holiness,
 “ Love, &c. Incense, Perfumes, &c. that
 “ their Sacrifice might be acceptable through
 “ him; besides the Inclusion of temporal Bles-
 “ sings to such of them as kept the Way of
 “ the *Elahim*.

“ They brought the Creatures, the Types
 “ of him that was to bear their Crimes, laid
 “ their Hands, so Sins upon them; offered
 “ them to the Representative of him, who
 “ slew and offered them to him whom the
 “ *Fire* represented; part to be burnt, and
 “ part eaten. They brought the Meat-Offer-
 “ ings, the Types of his good Works who
 “ was to justify them; so both, in Figure of
 “ Meat; the Priest put Oil, Salt, Frankin-
 “ cense upon them, burned part and eat the
 “ rest.

“ One Sacrifice was of one Species of Crea-
 “ tures, another of another Species, to typify
 “ this or that Article in the real Sacrifice. One
 “ was sacrificed in this Manner, another in
 “ that, as *Isai. xliii. 7.*—*He is brought as a*
 “ *Lamb to the Slaughter, and as a Sheep before*
 “ *her Shearers is dumb.* *Jer. xi. 19.* *But I*
 “ *was like a Lamb or an Ox that is brought to*
 “ *the Slaughter, and I knew not that they had*
 “ *devised Devices against me.* Nay, even the
 “ different Parts of each, to typify the Man-
 “ ner in which, what each typified, was to be
 “ sacrificed, eaten, or &c. As, *not a Bone of*
 “ *him shall be broken, they shall look upon him*
 “ *whom they have pierced.* By burning the
 “ Fat and the Reins, Emblems of Pride and
 “ Concupiscence and other carnal Affections,
 “ that the Sufferings of Christ should con-
 “ sume them, so that they should be erased out
 “ of the Hearts of Christian Believers. One
 “ Addition,

" Addition, Gift, or Offering of one Species,
 " was to be made, so prepared, with this; and
 " another of another Species, otherwise pre-
 " pared, was to be with that; nay, even Ad-
 " ditions to them, of Salt to all, of Oil and
 " of Frankincense to some, and some without
 " Oil and Frankincense; to shew typically
 " what was to be really added to each Article
 " in the (*great*) Sacrifice. Nay, even of the
 " Parts which were to be burnt, some were to
 " be burnt in one Place, some in another, as
 " *Exod. xxix. 14. Levit. viii. 17. ix. 11, 16,*
 " *17. Heb. xiii. 11.* The Flesh &c. of the
 " Sin Offering was to be burnt without the
 " Camp, to typify Christ's suffering without
 " the Gate. There was one Plan laid, to
 " which both the Types and Original were to
 " conform. Though it be said, *all Things*
 " *must be fulfilled which were spoken by Moses;*
 " *that it might be fulfilled which was spoken by*
 " *the Prophet, &c.* This is saying that all the
 " various Types, and all the hieroglyphical and
 " various Descriptions by the Prophets, are to-
 " gether a strict Revelation of that Plan
 " which was to be accomplished then, and of
 " all that was to be predicted that was to
 " come to pass till the End: To which *Matt.*
 " *v. 18. For verily I say unto you, till Heaven*
 " *and Earth pass, one jot or one Tittle shall in*
 " *no wise pass from the Law, till all be fulfilled."*

I have now proved that the *Cherubim* were
 an hieroglyphical Picture of the Covenant of

Grace, and the Parties in it, *viz.* The Trinity and the God-Man, and that every Body knew it.—That the Tabernacle was the dwelling Place of that Person of the Deity who was to be manifest in the Flesh, and that every Body knew that also.—That the Sacrifice and Atonement by Blood, was the Sacrifice of Christ, and Atonement by his Blood—That the Priest was but a Personator of the great High Priest, and that it was well known by the whole Body of Believers, it being said so in express Words.—That the People laid *their Sins* upon the Head of the Priest, and the Priest upon the Head of the Sacrifice, and consequently that both of them shewed they knew they could not bear their own Sins, but that another of more Worth, than either the *Sacrifice* or the *Sacrificer*, was to bear their Sins for them; besides the Nature of the Case, which alone would have led any Man of Sense into the Meaning of the Rites and Ceremonies. And any Body who considers it now, must upon Reflection conclude that the Church under the Law knew what it meant, unless he is weak enough to think that God could ever be pleased with seeing their Clothes clean, and their Hands and Feet washed when they came into his Sanctuary; or that the Blood of a Calf, a Lamb or Goat, could be any *equal* Satisfaction to Divine Justice for the Sins of Man. Such a Service could never reach the *Conscience of the Votary*, or be pleasing in the Sight of God, unless

unless *Faith* went along with the external Act, and it was performed with a View to that full Satisfaction for the Sins of the whole World made by the Sacrifice of the Lamb of God. “(a) *The Just*, says the Prophet, *shall live by Faith*,” and “(b) *Faith*, saith St. Paul, *is the Substance of Things hoped for*, *ελεγχος* the Conviction *of Things not seen*,” either then the Jews had *Faith*, or they had not *Life*. Either they knew that *Jesus was the End of the Law*, or their Consciences were not cleansed, because “(c) *The Gifts and Sacrifices* under the Law *could not make him that did the Service perfect, as pertaining to the Conscience*.” We have then the Wisdom and Goodness of God to assure us that they did not know what their Ordinances aimed at, for the *Law* says, the Blood was to atone for their Sin, and St. Paul says it could not; it was then inconsistent with the Wisdom of God to give them the Type without assuring them it was a Type, because *Faith* only could make the Type effectual to the Purpose it was instituted for, *viz. to atone for Sin*. If *Faith* only can save, and not Works, neither our own nor those of the Law, how hard doth it bear upon the Goodness of God to suppose he would suffer the Church, for thousands of Years, to rest upon such deceitful, fallacious Hopes? *Works can't save*, and yet they were taught nothing else. The Supposition therefore that Mankind was ever

(a) Hab. ii. 4.

(b) Heb. xi. 1.

(c) ix. 9.

left ignorant of the Doctrine of a future State, and of the Way and Means to attain Happiness and avoid Misery in it, is the greatest Reflection possible upon the Wisdom, Goodness and Justice of God. I have run through some Particulars of the Law, to shew they were so *worded* and so *circumstantiated* as to leave no Doubt of their being *Shadows*, and no more than *Shadows*, of what was to come: I might have gone through every Branch of it, and shewn that each had the same Tendency, and was always understood in that View; but if I am right in these Points, or indeed in any *one* of them, all the rest will follow by direct Implication, and the Consequence that the Doctrine of a future State did make the whole of the *Mosaic* œconomy as much as the *Sense* of a Book doth the whole of the Book, will be established beyond all reasonable Doubt.

It was for want of this Faith which should have grown up with the Leaves that Christ cursed the Fig-tree which had Leaves and no (a) Fruit. The Leaves of the Fig-tree and the Fruit shoot out together, so should *Faith* and the *Types* have done.

I am obliged to cite the *Hebrew* Words, because I would neither give nor take the Advantage of the Translation. When it appears that the Types were understood, and were observed *only* with Regard to the spiritual Sense or real Meaning of them, it may perhaps be

(a) Mat. xxi. 19.

thought unnecessary to seek for other Aids to prove that the Church under the Law had Hopes in Christ of another and better Life, but as the Gentleman, whose more particular Consideration I design this for, builds so much on the contrary Position, calling it “ (a) one of “ the most illustrious Marks of Truth in Revelation,” “ a Proposition so clear and evident “ that he need not give himself the Trouble “ to prove it were it not *for Men’s Love to Paradox and System, and the odd Humour of “ your Religionists and slavish Thinkers, who to “ give a Relish to their System powder it with “ Paradoxes;*” “ (b) and that the Demonstration “ of the divine Legation of *Moses* founded on “ this *illustrious Mark*, is a Demonstration so “ strong and beautiful, and, at the same time, “ appears to be so easy and simple, that one “ cannot tell whether the Pleasure of the Discovery, or the Wonder that it is now to make, “ be the greater,” “ And that he is ashamed “ of a Task that affords him no better Objections.” Since this Gentleman is so fond of the Foundation he has *erected* his airy Castle upon, and so confident of the Goodness of it, I shall now proceed in the Method he hath pointed out, and consider the Evidence we have, of the same Truth I have endeavoured to illustrate, from the accidental Speeches, Actions and Confessions of Men under the Law, and shall consider the Answer he hath given to

(a) Part I. p. 5—7.

(b) Part II. Vol. II. p. 449.

Some of those Authorities which have been already produced. The first Account we have is in Genesis.—(a) “ God said, Let us make Man “ in our Image, after our דמות Likenesses.” The Author of the Book of *Wisdom* construes this to refer to Immortality, and I can see no Reason why that Idea should not be included in the Words; Free-Will, and the Power of knowing are Particulars in which Man alone of all Creatures in this System resembles God; and Man alone was designed for Immortality, and that is a remarkable *Likeness* in which Man resembles God—but the Execution of this Resolution, *let us make Man in our Image, after our Likenesses*, proves evidently that Man was made for Immortality, and I think that this Particular is thereby marked out for one of the *Resemblances* which Man bears to God, because the *Manner* in which this Resolution was put into Execution is related thus.—“ The “ Lord God formed Man of the Dust of the “ Ground, and breathed into his Nostrils נשמת “ חיים a *Soul of Lives*; but האדם the Bo- “ dy was for נפש חיה, an *Animal Frame*.” Here we see that what God breathed or infused into Man had חיים in it, and that האדם or what he formed out of the Dust was no more than נפש חיה a *living Animal*. Here are two Words which are never confounded, נשם and נפש, the first is simply *Halitus* or *Flatus*, not

(a) i. 26.

(b) ii. 23.

a Portion of Man's Breath, I mean the Idea is not taken from thence, but of the Air; and the Distinction is kept up by the Addition of חיים to it, which in the plural Number is *Lives*, and in the *Hebrew* Idiom, signifies Immortality; and the second, is the *Body*, as it is mechanised Matter. This observed and the Confusion vanishes—אדם was formed out of the אדמה, and was no more than נפש חיה a *living* or *animal Frame*, into which God infused an immortal *Flatus*. Hence it is plain, that God's infusing נשמת חיים was not the Reason that the Body (אדם) became, as the *English* words it, a *living Soul*, but the Formation of the Dust made a Lump of Clay capable of animal Life, and the immediate Gift of God endued the Animal with a superior Principle which is immortal. Mr. Warburton * says right enough, that *living Soul* means a *living Animal*, but נשמת חיים means no such Thing, here lies the Stress of the Argument, see *Moses's Sine Principio* where p. 24—in the *Introduction* this Matter is treated of at large, and this accurate Gentleman, instead of catching us in taking the Advantage of the *English Translation*, is caught himself in the Snare. The original Words are one Proof that *Moses* has not so *studiously* avoided, as he seems to think, a mention of what might have led them to the Hopes of another World, and I think

* P. 554.

might

might have led them also to the Interpretation of the Words above, *let us make Man in our Image, after our Likenesses*, and pointed out *this* as one Resemblance they bore to God.

But whatever comes of my Argument, says this great Man, †St. Paul I hope may be believed; who thus comments the very Texts in Question, — And so it is written, The first Man, Adam, was made a living Soul, the last Adam was made a quickning Spirit (a).—

He doth so; but not to prove, that *Adam's Soul* was mortal, but to prove that there is a natural Body, and a spiritual Body. A *natural Body*, which gives *natural Life*, and a *spiritual Body*, which gives *spiritual Life*. There is, says he, a *natural Body*, and there is a *spiritual Body*. And so it is written, *The first Man, Adam, was made a living Soul*, or *Animal*; and this is just what the holy Text says, אדם, which was composed of Dust, became a *living Animal*; but this is not saying, that God did not infuse a נשמה with חיים into the Body. And what *St. Paul* opposes the Nature of the first to that of the second *Adam* for, is because the one gave only *animal Life* to his Children, the second gives *immortal Life*. The one is our *natural Father*, the other our *spiritual Father*. What hath this to do with our Dispute? He may as well prove from it, that we have no *Souls* at all.

† P. 555.

(a) 1 Cor. xv. 45.

The next Thing which implies they had received the Promise of *a Rest* in another World is the Sanctification of the seventh Day for a Day of *שבת* Rest. “ (a) *And God blessed the seventh Day, and sanctified it.*” The Reason which follows, “ *because in it he rested from all his Work,*” by no means supposeth that the Sabbath was not made for Man, because our (b) Lord affirms it was. What it was made to Man for, or what it was a Figure of, is clearly explained by St. Paul, Heb. iv. which let the Reader consider, Ver. 9, &c. “ *There remaineth therefore a Rest to the People of God. For he that is entered into his Rest, he also hath ceased from his own Works, as God did from his. Let us therefore labour to enter into that Rest.*” By his Reasoning it appears, that God’s resting from his Work on the seventh Day, was a Sign to Man that he should rest from his Labours, (another Instance in which Man is like God,) and that the seventh Day was sanctified in Memorial of it. It is not said that *Adam* knew it, but it is said that God appointed it him for a Day of *Rest*; and I must beg leave to suppose that he did know why God sanctified it to him; I think one implies the other. That the Sabbath was appointed to the *Jews*, in Memorial of the same *Rest*, is proved in the Chapter last referred to. The *Law* calls it *שבת קדש ליהוה* the

(a) Gen. ii. 3.

(b) Mark ii. 27.

Resting a Rest " holy or separate to *Jehovah*," which implies it was a Type ; the Sabbath being made for Man, not for *Jehovah*, and the *Son of Man*, (God incarnate) being Lord of the *Rest* ; therefore it was a *Rest* to separate Man to *Jehovah*, or to the *Son of Man*.

There is a remarkable Particular in this Chapter which shews the People knew what the *Sabbath* was, and what *Manna* was ; the *Manna* I must observe was the (a) *Bread of Life* which Christ brought down from Heaven. (b) The People gathered on the sixth Day twice as much as on any other Day, as knowing that there would be none to be gathered on the Day of *Rest*, the typical Bread we eat here then ceasing : or the Bread which endureth to eternal Life being to be gathered in the six Days of Work, the Time allotted us to work here. How the Rulers of the Congregation came not to be aware of it, I can't tell ; it was the Command of God, ver. 4. But the Case was just the same when Christ came. I may take Notice here that this *Manna* ceased as soon as they had got Possession of *Canaan*, the *Land of Rest*. *Moses* *Exod.* xxxi. 16. is very express as to the Design of the Sabbath. " The Children of *Israel* shall keep the Sabbath לעשות את השבת (mighty oddly translated to observe the Sabbath) to represent a *Rest to their Generations*, the everlasting Co-

(a) *Joh.* vi. 31—58.(b) *Exod.* xvi. 22.

“ venant betwixt me and betwixt the Children of *Israel*; *it is a Sign* for ever.” *וְיָ* for or also; “ in six Days the Lord made Heaven and Earth, and on the seventh Day he “ rested and was refreshed.” They have translated and pointed the Words wrong, and I must refer to the Original. A Passage of *Ezekiel* is plain enough, as it is translated, that the *Sabbath* was given as a token of something further than that God had rested from his Work. “ (a) I gave them my *Sabbaths* to be a Sign “ between me and them, *that they might know* “ that I am the Lord that sanctify them.” Whatever is meant by God’s *sanctifying* them, the Institution of the *Sabbath* was to teach it them. *St. Paul* says, as above, that it was being sanctified to *eternal Rest*, therefore the Institution of the *Sabbath* was to teach them that they were to be sanctified to eternal Rest, or that there was a *Rest* to the People of God. I have been the more particular here, because it is a very comprehensive Thing, and shews the Hopes of all Men from the first *Adam* to the second.

That *Adam* was designed for Immortality is implied also, as I have observed in those Words, “ *in the Day thou eateth thereof thou shalt “ surely die.*” But doth it follow from hence that he was to have lived in another World, Body and Soul together? indisputably, because

(a) Ezek. xx. 12.

H

he

he could not have lived for ever in this World. And as his Pardon upon Repentance after the *Fall* implies he was to be restored to what he had lost, it is thence evident he knew his Body was to be raised and carried into the other World, whether the Sacrifice and Atonement by Blood was known or no to be but a Type, else his Sin had not been forgiven, if the Curse were not to be taken off.

I shall pass over what follows from hence to the Translation of *Enoch*, because I have enlarged upon most of the Particulars already, only shall take notice of a mighty weak Argument brought by this judicious Writer to prove that *Moses* designedly omitted every thing which relates to a future State. “ (a) *In the History of the Fall it is to be observed that he mentions only the Instrument of the Agent the Serpent; not the Agent himself the Devil; and the Reason is plain; there was a close Connexion between that Agency—the spiritual Effects of the Fall—The Work of Redemption—and the Doctrine of a future State.*” Suppose *Adam* had not known that the Devil actuated the *Serpent* when *Eve* was deceived, would this have lessened *Adam*’s Sin or altered the Nature of it? He knew what he had done without knowing who was *Eve*’s Tempter, she was his; and the Wages of his Sin was eternal Death. This he knew: this he confessed, and had received a

(a) Part II. p. 449, 50.

Promise of Pardon, and his knowing who or
 what the Tempter was let him into the Know-
 ledge of nothing further. *The spiritual Ef-*
fects of the Fall were just the same with re-
 gard to the Necessity he was under of being
 redeemed before he could be happy; know-
 ing there was a *Devil* would be but a shallow
 Argument to prove there was a future State.
 I here allow, against all Probability, that
Adam did not know who was the Tempter;
 and I should be glad to know how ἰσὺς Satan or
 Διάβολος or such clear Descriptions of the Apost-
 ate Spirit, or Body of fallen Spirits, that either
 of those Words should so distinctly point them
 out: Because Mr. *Warburton* says the Word
Satan was omitted in the Account of *David's*
 numbering the People, as related in *Samuel*,
 which was wrote before the Captivity, and in-
 serted in the Book of *Chronicles*, which was
 wrote afterwards, when the Knowledge of an-
 other World began to *dawn*; as if informing
 us there was a Body of fallen Spirits would
 have let us into the *Secret* of there being a fu-
 ture State, when the Knowledge of the Being
 of God and good Angels did not. Thus in-
 considerately will the greatest Men argue when
 they are resolved to defend a favourite Notion.
Satan and *Devil* signify only an *Adversary*,
 and neither of these Words express so much
 of the Nature of that Apostate Spirit as *Serpent*
 does; but if they did, the Knowledge of a
 future State hath no Connexion with the
 H 2 Devil.

Devil. “ (a) In *Moses’s* History of *Enoch’s* Translation to Heaven, there is (our Author says) so studied an Obscurity, that several of the Rabbins did not understand it.

If the *Rabbins* had not shewn themselves the most stupidly blind of any Set of Men upon the Face of the Earth, forsaken of God and common Sense; if the Scriptures had not so often predicted the almost incredible Infatuation of that apostate Rabble, and denounced so many severe Denunciations against them and their Followers, there might have been some Shadow of an Argument in their Authority, and some small Excuse in producing it against the Meaning of Scripture. If it was so obscurely told, how come it ever understood? The Authors of the Book of *Wisdom* and *Ecclesiasticus* understood it; how came they by the Knowledge of what it meant? They either had it by *Tradition*, or from *Moses*; if by the first, then others had it the same Way; if from the latter, then there is not that studied Obscurity in the Account. But can it be supposed that Mankind had never heard of *Enoch’s* Translation till *Moses’s* Time? They in whose Days it happen’d must know it, and there are but a very few Hands for it to pass through, from *Methuselah*, *Enoch’s* Son, to *Moses*, and doubtless was a Story much better known than our Conquest by *William the First*.

(a) Part II. p. 450.

Had no body ever heard of it before, and we had had no fuller an Account of it than *that Enoch was not, for God took him*, there might have been some little Pretence for disputing the Inference we draw from it.—But if the Account of *Enoch's Translation* be but an obscure Intimation of a future State, his *Prophecy* was not; he prophesied in plain Terms of the Judgment to come, “ (a) saying, Behold, the Lord cometh with ten thousand of his Saints, to execute Judgment upon all, and to convince all that are ungodly among them of all their ungodly Deeds which they have ungodly committed, and of all their hard Speeches, which ungodly Sinners have spoken against him.” We see these great Truths were well known to all Men at that time of Day; and just in the same Manner as it is now, some believed, some disbelieved; some blasphemed, and others asserted the Truth of them, and none, even the most abandoned, were ignorant of such Doctrines being asserted for true, though they pretended to make a Jest of them.

—*How unlike the Scripture Relation of the same Case in Elijah*, says our Author, *is the Account of Enoch's Translation.*

Elijah's, it is true, is related in more Words, and the Manner distinctly told; but this it seems did not convince any body, the good

(a) Jude 14.

Hezekiah, a few Years after, is found ignorant of it, or of what was meant by it. What Cobweb Stuff hath this poor Man, through an over Zeal to what *he thinks* a Support of *Moses's* Authority, intrench'd himself in! This is *weaving and trusting in the Spider's Web*. Suppose now that no body had understood what *Moses* meant, in saying, *Enoch was not, for God took him*, we see they could not but have it by Tradition. It is generally allowed his *Prophecy* was handed down the same Way, and if that doth not speak plain enough, I don't know what doth; and if *Moses* had not had a Mind People should know what he meant, when he mentioned *Enoch's* Translation, why did he mention it at all?

“(a) In his History of the *Patriarchs*, he
 “ (*Moses*) entirely omits, or throws into the
 “ darkest Shades, says the learned *Warburton*,
 “ the Accounts of these Revelations, which
 “ we learn, from the Writers of the New-
 “ Testament, some of them were actually
 “ favoured with, concerning the Redemption
 “ of Mankind; of which we shall give, ere
 “ long, a great and noble Instance in the Case
 “ of *Abraham, &c.*” It would have swell'd
 the Bible to a most enormous Size, to have
 given a succinct and particular Account of the
 History of so many Years as the Book of
Genesis hath taken up; and what Use would

it have been to us? They all from *Adam* downwards acted upon the same Hopes, had been all put upon the same Footing, and the Church Service had but one common Plan, I speak of the Church of God, who, though Length of Time, Carelessness, &c. might have lost the Use of some Rites and Ceremonies, yet agreed in the main; and the Religion from *Adam* to the Patriarchs, from the Patriarchs to *Moses*, and from *Moses* to Christ, was with Believers the same in Sum and Substance, and the Accounts which this Gentleman thinks *Moses* hath thrown into the darkest Shades, will convince any Man of it, who will be at the Pains of putting different Parts of Scripture together. The Heathen, or Idolaters, those who forsook the Church of God, set up the Powers of the Element of Air, the secondary Agents, and under God the real Dispensers of the Benefits of this Life to us; they set these up against God, applied the Rites and Ceremonies, which had been instituted in Memory of the Redeemer, to these new Gods, so retained the outward Form of the true Religion; had their sacred Images, Hieroglyphicks, Tabernacles, Temples, Altars, Prophets, Priests and Kings, in much the same Manner as the Church of God had; nay, retained till very low down, a traditionary Knowledge of the great Truths of Revelation, as the Reader may see fully proved in the new Account of the Confusion of Tongues—the Trinity of the Gentiles,

and occasionally in Mr. *Hutchinson's* other Writings. As there were no more than these two Plans, a short Hint of either Side was sufficient to give the Information aimed at; and what is thought obscure, is often owing to the Badness of the Translation—As for Instance, on *Noah's* coming out of the Ark, after the Flood, he offered Burnt-offerings, which were accepted, and among other things, God says, *I, even I, (a) נקיים את בריתי אתכם will raise up my Purifier of their Substance.* ברית by the Rules and Custom of the Language is derived from בר to *purify* or *cleanse*, and signifies *be* or *that* which purifies, “ as an *Agent*, “ the Purifier; as an *Action*, Purification; as “ a *Patient*, that purified; as a *Type*, the Representation of the Agent, and Manner; as “ a *Description*, the Terms.” For Proof of what I now say, I must refer to *the Trinity of the Gentiles*, where, p. 119—146, he will find it at large. This and some few other Points have been contested by the Rev. *Arthur Bedford*, in whose Pamphlets and those wrote against him, * the Objections and Answers may be seen; and if the learned *Warburton* has any thing farther to object, it shall have a candid Consideration: and in the mean time

(a) Gen. ix. 8.

* *Some Observations on Mr. Catcott's Sermon; Remarks upon the Observations—Answer to the Observations by the Rev. Mr. Catcott—Examination of the Remarks upon, and Mr. Catcott's Answer to, the Observations—The Rev. Mr. Gittin's Answer to the Rev. Mr. Bedford—And the Examiner examined.*

shall suppose this to be the Signification of the Word ; and the Hint above to *Noah* and his Sons will be *very far* from being a dark and obscure one.

The (a) Instance of *Abraham's* offering up *Isaac*, which is here referred to as an Evidence of a *studious Caution* to keep out of Sight the Doctrine of a future State, is very far from being so, if you will allow a Connexion betwixt that Doctrine and the Work of Redemption—One Verse will shew how little *cautious Moses* was, or rather how *careful* to inculcate the Doctrine which led to it—Mount *Moriah* was the Mountain where *Isaac* was going to be offered, and this was the Mount on which our Lord was crucified—This Mountain *Abraham* called (as was the Custom to give descriptive and prophetick Names) (b) יהוה יראה *Jehovah will appear*. The Sacred Historian adds אשר יאמר היום *which is said at this Day, in the Mountain Jehovah will appear*. This is a literal Translation of the Words, and as this was so illustrious a typical Representation of the Death of Christ on this Mount, I can see no imaginable Reason why the grammatical Construction of the Words should not stand. But the Blessing to *Abraham*, in the next Verse or two, is so clear and distinct as to leave no Uncertainty—
 “ *Thy Seed shall possess the Gate of his Enemies ; and in thy Seed shall all the Nations of*

(a) Div. L. Part II. p. 451—2. (b) Gen. xxii. 14.

“ *the Earth be blessed.*” Put this to the same Promise to *Isaac, Jacob, Judah* and *David*, and the Declarations to the *Jews* that God respected not them, but raised them into a great Nation, (a) to *raise up* the Purifier he promised by Oath to their Fathers. He that will put these things together, will see evidently that they could refer to nothing less than the Seed who was to bruise the Serpent’s Head, and so diffuse a universal Blessing to all the Sons of *Adam*. I could instance in many more Particulars of *Abraham’s* History, and shew the great Care that was taken to make continual References to the great *Purifier*, whose Blood was to cleanse polluted Man, and whose Oil was to expel the Poison, the Venom of the Serpent out of our Veins; but it will be tedious to the Reader. This is sufficient to shew how chimerical the Notion is that *Moses* studiously avoided a Mention of what led to the Doctrine of a future State. I don’t well know what the Gentleman alludes to, when he says, “ This shews the Weakness of that Evasion, “ which would reconcile the *Omission* to the “ People’s Knowledge of it, by supposing “ they had been so well instructed by the Patriarchs, that *Moses* had no need to say any “ thing more on that Head.” If the *Patriarchs* knew it so well, it will be very hard to conceive either that they should not instruct

(a) Deut. viii. 18.

Div. L. Part ii. p. 452.

their Families in it, or that their Families should so soon forget it as *Moses's* time. It is remarkable what God says of *Abraham*, Gen. xviii. 18—*Abraham shall surely become a great and mighty Nation, and all the Nations of the Earth shall be blessed in him; for I know him that he will command his Children, and his Household after him, and they shall keep the Way of the Lord, to do Justice and Judgment, that the Lord may bring upon Abraham that which he hath spoken of him.* None could be Heirs of *Abraham's Righteousness*, but those who had *Abraham's Faith*. And if he taught his Children and his Household the true Faith, he alone would have spread the true Faith over a great Extent of Ground, through many Nations.—*To do Justice and Judgment* may be thought not to come up to the *Righteousness* which is by Faith; but it was *Abraham's Faith* in *Jehovah*, his firm Reliance on the great Blessor that was to come of his Line, whom *Jehovah* promised to send, that was imputed to him for Righteousness; לצדקה, which is the Word that is translated *Justice* above, and משפט is *Judicium*, *Jus*, *Lex*, *Statutum*, *præceptum*, &c. as *Marius de Calassio* construes the Word. Now—*they shall keep the Way of the Lord, to do Righteousness and the Law or Precept*, may very well be supposed to mean the *Way* which *Jehovah* put *Adam* and his Posterity in to Salvation; which was to believe in the promised Seed, and to observe those Rites

Rites and Ceremonies which in the Law of *Moses* are so often called *the Statutes and Judgments* of God. This was the *Way* of *Jehovah*, and he never shewed them any other.

The next Head, "That the Importance of
 " the Doctrine of a future State to Society was
 " well understood by *Moses*," I readily grant,
 and turn over the six following Leaves to
 p. 465, where we have the Woman of (a) *Te-koah*
 unluckily enough produced as a Witness
 against the Truth; but as it is usual to cross
 examine Witnesses, I shall take the Liberty to
 do so here—In the Words next to those cited
 by this Gentleman, she says—"God hath de-
 "vised Means, that his banish'd be not expelled
 " from him." Here is a plain and beautiful
 Allusion to the Covenant of Grace—God had
 banish'd Man from Paradise, from Heaven,
 from his Presence; but had devised Means that
 Man should not be lost, but brought home to
 him again. This is her Argument to *David*,
 whose Son was driven from him, from his
 Court, from his Presence.—"The King doth
 " not fetch home again his banish'd—but God
 " doth fetch home his, therefore the King is
 " faulty." And it is nothing but the *English*
 Translation which has misled the Gentleman
 here—She doth not say we are like Wa-
 ter spilt on the Ground, that *cannot* be gather'd
 up. But "for shall we die and be like Water
 " spread on the Ground, which will not be

(a) 2 Sam. xiv. 14.

"gather'd

“ gather’d up — and will not God pardon
 “ נפש? Yea, *he hath devised Means that his*
 “ *banished be not expelled from him. Now*
 “ *therefore I am come to speak to my Lord the*
 “ *King.*” It is the Mercy of God to lost banished

Man, his readiness to pardon our Lives, our Sin which she urges, and it was the most artful Thing possible for *Joab* to have put in her Mouth. The great *Shakespear*, than whom no Man hath finer Strokes of Nature in his Writings, hath imitated this beautiful Passage in his *Measure for Measure*. *Angelo* says to *Isabella*,

Ang. Your Brother is a Forfeit of the Law,
 And you but waste your Words.

Isab. Alas! Alas!

Why all the Souls that were, were forfeit
 once;

And he that might the Vantage best have took,
Found out the Remedy. How would you be,
 If he, which is the Top of Judgment, should
 But judge you, as you are? Oh think on
 that;

And Mercy then will breath within your
 Lips,

Like Man new made.

Nothing could have been better addressed to the Judgment of the King, or so effectually have raised Sentiments of Compassion. It represented the King as a Criminal before the Tribunal of his own Judge; this softened the Severity of the Judge in himself, and put him into an awful Dread; when she had thus artfully

fully reminded him of the forlorn State we were all in, she adds, " The King doth speak
 " this Thing as one which is faulty, in that
 " the King doth not fetch Home again his
 " Banished, for shall we die, and be like Wa-
 " ter spread on the Ground which will not be
 " gathered up, and will not God pardon Life !
 " *Yea, he hath devised Means that his Banished*
 " *be not expelled from him.*" I don't know
 that the whole Scripture affords an Instance of
 a finer Address to the Judgment and Passions,
 both at once, and scarce a fuller Confession of
 Faith. And yet all this the *Critick* hath turn-
 ed into a dull insipid Speech, which contradicts
 the very End it was made for. — " The King is
 " faulty in that he doth not pardon his Son,
 " for God casts us away like Water spilt upon
 " the Ground which cannot be gathered up
 " again: Neither doth God respect any Per-
 " son." A likely Argument this to soften the
Judge, awake the *Father*, and raise those ten-
 der Emotions which made the Soul of King
David long to go forth to his Son. *Joab* must
 have been both *Fool* and *Atheist*, before he
 could have argued in that Manner. It is the
 Fault of the Translation, but the *Linguist*
 might have seen it.

The next Passage which he cites from *Job*,
 as a positive Declaration against a future State,
 is only a Declaration that Man will not return
 to *this Life*; not that he will not be raised to
another: And if he had candidly cited the
 whole

whole Sentence it had appeared at once. —

“ (a) The Cloud is consumed and vanisheth
 “ away : So he that goeth down to the Grave,
 “ shall not come up : He shall return no more
 “ (thus far Mr. Warburton, but Job adds)
 “ to his *House*, neither shall his *Place* know
 “ him any more.” What could induce our

Author to cite this Passage and in *such a Man-
 ner*, I can’t imagine, unless he thought that
 no Body would turn to the *Bible*, and see whe-
 ther he had fairly represented it. One half of
 the Sentence without the other, as it stands in
 the *Divine Legation* (b), might be thought
 perhaps to look a little towards the Sense he
 would put upon it. As little to the Purpose is
 the other Citation from (c) Job, where he
 saith, “ Man lieth down (d) and riseth not till
 “ the *Heavens* be no more.” This we all be-
 lieve, that Heaven and Earth pass away at the
 Resurrection of Mankind, or that Man will
 not rise till the Time appointed for their Dis-
 solution. “ *The Heavens and the Earth*, saith
 “ St. Peter (e), are reserved unto Fire against
 “ the Day of Judgment, and Perdition of un-
 “ godly Men.” Job then talks like a *Christian*,
 and what follows, “ they shall not awake, nor
 “ be raised out of their *Sleep*” implies, if we
 may draw any Consequences from People’s
 Words, that he knew the Dead were only

(a) Job vii. 9, 10.
 — 12.

(d) P. 466.

(b) P. 465. l. 31.

(e) 2 Pet. iii. 7.

(c) xiv. v. 7.

asleep

asleep, and that the Heavens were to be *dissolved*, since he says *the Dead will not be raised out of their Sleep till the Heavens are no more.* עַד בִּלְתִּי שָׁמַיִם, till the Dissolution of the Heavens. I am aware that *till the Heavens are no more*, may be thought by some People to mean *for ever*, let them state the Argument that think so; and then if I can't justify my Interpretation I will give it up. I shall take in here that famous Passage of (a) *Job*, which our Author contends signifies only *worldly Prosperity* (b)—*I know that my Redeemer lives, &c.* I must cite the original Words—(a) גִּאֲלִי חַי וְאַחֲדוֹן עַל עֵפֶר יָקוֹם.

The Construction of this Part will lead us to the Meaning of the rest, and is literally thus —“ *I know that my Redeemer is Life, and that in the latter Days he shall arise in Dust.*” Man is made of *Dust*, and when *Jehovah* arose in the human Nature, he arose in *Dust*. To *arise* or *raise up*, is used in several other Prophecies of his coming—I have cited the Promise that *a Purifier* should arise, under this Term קוֹם. And *Deut. xviii. 15.* The Word is used to the *rising up* of the Prophet that was to be like *Moses*. It is a *stationary* Term, and expresses any Person's rising up to take an Office upon him. That אַחֲדוֹן *the latter Days or Time*, is the Day of Christianity one single Text will shew—“ It (c) shall

(a) Job xix. 25. (b) P. 432.—552. (c) Act. ii. 17.

“ come

“ come to pass in the *last Days*, I will pour
 “ out of my Spirit upon all Flesh.” The Pre-
 position על, *Noldius* p. 695. says, signifies *cum*,
una cum, and p. 697. *in*. So the direct Con-
 struction of the Words is that he knew, *His*
Redeemer was to arise in Flesh. And adds,
 ומבשרי אחזה אליו.

מבשרי. *Adam* says of *Eve*, *she is Flesh* מבשרי
 of my Flesh (a), made of the same Kind of
 Flesh that I am. So *Job* says, *I shall see God*
made of my Flesh. No Words can describe the
 Incarnation of God stronger than these of *Job*
 do, and we have a full Confession of his Faith
 in him, and Confidence that notwithstanding
 his Death, he should see his *God in human Na-*
ture, which if he hath not already, most cer-
 tainly will at that Day, *when every Eye shall*
behold him, and every Knee shall bow to him.
 If the learned Gentleman gets rid of this Text
 as now construed, in *twice seventy Pages*, I
 will submit the whole Cause; if he will please
 to consult the *Remarks upon the Observations*
 on a *Sermon* preached before the *Corporation of*
Bristol, by the *Rev. Mr. Catcott*, p. 75, &c.
 he will find this Text largely handled, and a
 Proof in the same Place that the *Power and*
Privileges of the *legal Redeemer*, was but typi-
 cal of the *Power and Privileges* of the *living*
Redeemer, and were designed to keep up the
 Memory of what a *Redeemer* was to do for
 Mankind.

(a) Gen. ii. 23.

I

But

But to return to Page 466. where even the *Psalmist* is brought in as bearing Evidence against the Resurrection of the Body—Hath this Gentleman forgot, or did he never read, or doth not he believe what *St. Peter* says of *David*? “ that he was (a) a *Prophet*, and knowing that “ God had sworn with an Oath to him, that of “ the Fruit of his Loins according to the Flesh, “ he would raise up *Christ* to sit on his Throne, “ that he seeing this before spake of the Resur- “ rection of *Christ*.”—We have *St. Peter*’s Authority that *David* did know there was to be a *Resurrection*; and yet *Mr. Warburton* says he did not. *St. Peter* says he has described it—*Mr. Warburton* says he did not know it. *St. Peter* cites his Words to prove it; *Mr. Warburton* cites them to disprove it. Had a *Collins* or a *Tindal*, a *Toland* or *Woolston*, given the *Apostle* the Lie in this barefaced Manner, I might have been justified in giving them some of those Titles of *Fool*, *Idiot*, *Madman*, and the like, which have been occasionally bestow’d upon them. But when the learned, sober, ferious and zealous *Warburton*, who hath labour’d out six Books to prove the Authority of one Prophet, shall in a single Line destroy that of two more, nay the Authority of the whole Bible, by setting the one Part of it at Variance with the other; I am at a Loss what to say, and shall leave the Reader to vent his Surprise and Indignation in his own Way.

(a) Acts ii. 30.

But

But the Psalmist doth say, " *In (a) Death there is no Remembrance of God: In the Grave who shall give him Thanks.*" He doth so, and therefore gives it as a Reason for his being raised from the Dead. Ver. 5. "Return *Jehovah* נפשי deliver my *Body*, for in Death there is no Remembrance of thee," and so on. And sufficient Ground it is of Prayer to God (whoever is the Speaker) that since in Death no Man could remember him, he would not suffer Death to triumph over him. This Psalm is *still* a full Proof of a Resurrection.

And again, " *(b) Jehovah* ה'עלית thou caufest to ascend from the Grave נפשי my Body; ה'יתני thou givest me Life from the Dead." The Resurrection of our Lord when it came to pass, and was historically related, is not done in stronger Words. " *(c) Unto thee Jehovah will I cry; and unto Jehovah will I make my Supplication, what Profit in my Blood, בדרתי אל שחת in my being held under the Dominion of Death.* שחת is Corruption or Dissolution, which he, who is the Subject of the Psalms, was not to see. He was to loose the Bands of Death before he saw Corruption, so adds, " *shall עפר Dust confess thee, shall it declare thy Truth?*" No, the Promises of raising him without seeing Corruption had been broke. Had his Body been held under the Bands of Death, the Promises

(a) Ps. vi. 5.

(b) xxx. 3.

(c) Ver. 8, 9.

of Mercy to Man in general had been of no Effect; and there would have been none to have praised God, or celebrated his Loving-kindness, *for the Dead know not any Thing*, but the Living do. To the same Purpose are those other Passages of the Psalms, “ (a) *Wilt thou shew Wonders to the Dead?*” No! they could not be sensible of it till restored to Life. All used as Arguments of firm Reliance on those general Promises from God of Mercy and Loving-kindness to Men; and I am afraid it is *Perverseness* of the Will, rather than *Weakness* of Understanding, which produces such Arguments as these against the general Sense of Scripture.

This Gentleman once before *deceived himself* in not considering the Context of a Passage he produced out of *Job*, which is much to the same as that he cites here * out of *Ecclesiastes* (b), which may be answered only by supplying what he hath omitted. — “ *The Living know they shall die, but the Dead know not any Thing, neither have they any more a Reward, for the Memory of them is forgotten.*” “ *Also their Love and their Hatred, and their Envy is now perished; neither have they any more a Portion for ever.*” — (How strong are these last Words, *Neither have they any more a Portion for ever.*

I dare say the Reader will be surprized our Author did not produce them, till he considers there would then have been no Excuse for o-

(a) Ps. lxxxviii. 10.

* P. 466. l. 23.

(c) Eccl. ix. 5.

mitting what he ought to have cited, and which shews the Weakness of the Argument raised from the former Part of the Sentence—*Neither have they any more a Portion for ever in any Thing that is done under the Sun.*

What the Royal Preacher urgeth this Doctrine for, is that Men might be persuaded to “ (a) *work while it is Day, because the Night cometh when no Man can work,*” or to use his own Words, “ *For God now accepteth thy Work,*”—“ *There is no Work, nor Device, nor Knowledge, nor Wisdom in the Grave whither thou goest,*” and under several emblematical Phrases exhorts to a religious Life.

Solomon says, Men when once dead will have no more Reward or Portion in this Life; and the judicious Warburton brings that to prove, they are to have none in another Life; and urges it, not as a Proof by Inference or Consequence from the Words, but as their *more express* Assertion; and to set a better Face upon the Argument, honestly cites half the Sentence.

If such reasoning doth not make his Admirers ashamed of him, I don't know what can. Scripture, it is plain, is not his Province, unless the *full Day be hath emerged* (b) into at once, hath weakened his Eye-sight, and the *dazzling Glare* be as yet too much for him.

The Dead know nothing—The Dead can't praise God—In the Grave all Things are for-

(a) John ix. 4.

(b) See the Pag. ult. Vol. I.

~~gotten~~—Man's never being to return to his House—Never to have any more Reward in this Life, are brought as Proofs that the Dead are not to be raised—That Man is to have no Reward in another World, in the Opinion of the *Prophets* themselves. Whether the Insincerity of the Citations, or the Weakness of the Deductions be greatest, I don't pretend to say. If he did not see how little they were to the Purpose, what could he see? If he did—it was mighty *ingenious* to produce them.

The Psalms are as full of the Doctrines of Christianity, and contain Predictions as express as Words can do. And this he may see at large in the latter Part of *The Use of Reason recovered by the Data in Christianity*. I shall cite a Place or two—Psal. xvi. 9. *My Flesh shall nest in Hope. For thou wilt not leave my Body in the Grave, nor suffer thy Holy One to see Corruption*, which is expressly applied by St. Peter to the Resurrection, who says David wrote the Words with that View; no Words can describe it more distinctly.—The next Verse speaks as expressly of his Exaltation to the right Hand of God—*Thou wilt shew me the Path of Lives: In thy Presence is Fulness of Joy, and at thy right Hand are Pleasures for evermore*. Christ's Atonement for Sin by his own Blood.—Ps. xl. 6. applied by St. Paul. *Sacrifice and Offering thou didst not desire—Burnt-Offering and Sin-Offering hath thou not required, Then said I, lo I come: In the Volume*
of

of the Book it is written *of me*. The *natural David* could not say God did not require *Burnt-Offerings* of him, and that he was to *fulfil the Will* of God, and that it was written in *the Volume of the Book*, that he was to be instead of the *Burnt-Offering* which the *Speaker* here says it was of him. Ps. li. Ver. 5. Behold יָצַד for a *Sin-Offering* was I shapen, and נָחַם for a *Trespas-Offering* did my *Mother conceive me*. See the whole Ps. *Data Part Hd. p. 342.*

Hezekiah's Prayer, had it contained any Thing contrary to the *Truth* of God, had never been recorded, much less by a *Prophet*, and the Gentleman, I hope for his own Sake, was not aware what a Door he opened to Infidelity; whilst he made *Prophets*, Men inspired by the Holy Ghost to assert *Falshoods*, and that in a Point of this Consequence.—If the *Holy Ghost* asserts that the *Body* is not to *rise again* in one Testament, who can believe it will, though it be affirmed that it will by the same Holy Person in the other; but this strikes at the Foundation and Authority of the whole Scriptures: If they contain such Falshoods, where is their Evidence and Authority?—Unless he will say that *David*, *Solomon* and *Isaiab* were not Prophets.

It is dreadful to see the licentious Freedom the Word of God is treated with, and what Lengths a fantastical Humour of Novelty will carry a Man to—This calls for a serious Repentance from the Author. But let us consider

*Hezekiah's Prayer a little—He had been sick unto Death, and by earnest Petitions had been raised from Death, whence also he received his Life in a Figure—(a) The Promise was behold I will רפא heal * thee; on the third Day thou shalt go up to the House of the Lord. This was a pretty parallel Case with that King whose Body was to be healed the third Day; and carries as evident Marks in it of its Relation to that grand Event, as the Cases of Isaac or the Prophet Jonab do; and the King exults with great Joy on the noble Prospect, which was quickened by the Earnest he had received of it in his own Person. “ I said in the cutting “ off my Days I shall go to the Gates of the “ Grave.” I feared I should have been held under the Power of the Grave, a Captive in the Bands of Death—but now hath thou in Love delivered my Body from the Corruption of Dissolution. We may say here, as St. Peter does of David, that he died and was buried and saw Corruption, and therefore doth not speak of himself, but being a Prophet spake this of the Resurrection of him who saw no Corruption: and in his Person, therefore says —“ The Grave cannot praise thee, Death cannot celebrate thee,” nor do ירד' בור the Sub-*

(a) 2 Kin. xx. 5.

(b) Isa. xxxviii.

* רפא is to *heal* or *repair*, taking the Idea from rearing up repairing a Building that was decayed or fallen down, see 1 King. xviii. 30. “ And he רפא repaired the Altar of the “ Lord that was broken down.”

jects of the Pit or, they that are down in the Pit, trust in thy Truth. Which it is impossible they should till they are brought up out of the Pit, when they will praise God, which is the meaning of the Repetition that follows,—*The Living, the Living, he shall praise thee, as I do this Day.* Now consider this good King as a Person who had received his Life as it were by a Resurrection, and so the Scripture represents it, and this Story as well as the Words of the *Psalmist*, and the Speech of the Woman of *Tekoah*, are sufficient *alone* to overturn our Author's Thesis, so unlucky is he in the Choice of his Proofs.

The Text from Jeremiah, * *Our Fathers have sinned and are not, and we have born their Iniquities*, (a) “implies, Mr. Warburton says, “that the Fathers being dead bore no Part of “the Punishment of their Sins, but that it was “all thrown upon their Children.”

We will suppose the Prophet might have been instructed in the true Notion of a *future State*, namely, that its Rewards and Punishments are *future*, and do not commence till the Resurrection, and then he might say *our Fathers are dead, and do not now suffer*; and if the Consequence of a Parent's Sin ever descends, as the ill Influence of the Example too commonly doth, and in his Case, most remarkably had, on the Children, he might say,

* P. 467. l. 1.

(a) Jer. v. 7.

and we bear their Iniquities, the Consequence of their Sins, in the Loss of our religious and civil Rights; he might say this; without affecting or even thinking of, the Doctrine of a future State. The *Nation* not being punished in this World, till the Measure of their Iniquity was full, is but a wretched Proof that *Men* will not be punished in the other World.

But though this Text is of no Service to him, in support of his Thesis, yet it will help me to destroy it. Since we are so plainly told that the *Fathers* sinned without bearing their Part in the Punishment of their Sins, which was fallen on the Children, *Our Fathers sinned and are not, and we bear their Iniquities*—It was *all* thrown upon the Children, says Mr. *Warburton*, and consequently temporal Rewards and Punishments were not the Sanction of the *Jewish* Dispensation, which destroys a main Pillar of this Tower of *Babel*, the D. L.

Thus neither in the *cool Philosophy* of the Author of *Ecclesiastes*, nor amidst the *Distresses* of the *Psalmist*, or the *Exultations* of good *Hezekiah* do we find any Thing but a sure and joyful Hope of a Resurrection to eternal Life, and there wants no *Subterfuges* or Recourse to *meer Tradition*, to shew this Doctrine was firmly believed from Age to Age throughout the whole *Jewish Dispensation*.

We must now shift the Scene from the *old* to the *new* Testament, “ the inspired Writers

“ of which p. 468. he says *expresly* assure us
 “ of the same Thing; that the Doctrine of a
 “ future State of Rewards and Punishments
 “ did not make part of the *Mosaic* Dispen-
 “ sation.”

Their Evidence he divides into two Parts;
 —“ the first proving that *temporal* Rewards
 “ and Punishments were the *Sanction* of the
 “ *Jewish* Dispensation: the *second* that it had
 “ no other.”

To prove the first he refers to 1 Tim. iv. 8.
*Bodily Exercise profiteth little: but Godliness is
 profitable to all Things, having the Promise of
 the Life that now is, and of that which is to
 come.* This Text, he will have it, signifies that
 “ though numerous ritual Observances were
 “ enjoined by the Law, and some there must
 “ needs be under the Gospel, yet they are of
 “ little Advantage in Comparison of *moral Ob-*
 “ *servances*, which under both Religions, had
 “ the proper Rewards of each annexed to *them*
 “ *only.*”—The Apostle doth not say one Word
 about *moral Observances*, much less doth he
 make any Comparison betwixt them and any
 other Duty, lest of all does, or could, he say,
 that the *Rewards* are annexed *only* to *moral Ob-*
servances; this is setting aside *Faith* and the
Merits of Christ; if *moral Observances* entitle
 to the Rewards, whereto serveth *Faith*? God
 is of purer Eyes than to behold Iniquity, and
 they that will see God must be like him—but
 it is not Morality that *saves* or *entitles* us to
 the

the Rewards. What St. Paul says, is—"re-
 fuse profane and old Wives Fables," such
 for Instance as *the mad Schemes of Heathen Phi-
 losophy*, "and exercise thyself unto Godliness,
 "for bodily Exercise" that which concerns the
 Body, and not the Soul, this Life and not the
 next, serves but to little Purpose, but Religion
 entitles us to the Care of Providence both *here*
and hereafter—*having the Promise of this Life,*
and of that which is to come. What mention is
 there here *that under the Jewish Religion were*
promised the Rewards of the Life that now is;
and under the Christian, of that which is to come.
 He set out with saying the New Testament
expresly assured us, that temporal Rewards were
 the *Jewish Sanction*, but here confesses that
 this Text doth not *expresly assure us* of any
 such Thing, because that it hath such a mean-
 ing must be proved * *from other Passages of*
the same Writer, where he informs us that
Christians have not the Promise "of the Life
 "that now is;" I am sure those Words prove
 no such Thing, nor is there the least Mention
 or Hint of the *Law or ritual Observances* in
 them. They say no more nor less than what
 Christ doth to all Christians, "(a) Take no
 "Thought, saying, what shall we eat? or
 "what shall we drink? or wherewithal shall
 "we be clothed? —" Your heavenly Father
 "knoweth that ye have need of all these Things.

* P. 469. l. 1.

(a) Matt. vi. 32, 33.

But

But seek ye first the *Kingdom of God*, and his *Righteousness*, and all *these Things* " shall be added unto you." I think this is annexing a Promise of this Life to *Godliness*. " Let your " Conversation be without Covetousness, saith " St. Paul, and be content with such Things " as ye have:" for he hath said, *I will never leave thee, nor forsake thee*, so there is no Occasion to twist and turn the Text above; which, whatever others may, can be of no Service to him. *Godliness* must either mean the Righteousness of the Law, or the Righteousness which is by Faith; it can't mean both; nor can it mean the first, because the Law was abrogated, and the Apostle would not order *Timothy* to exercise himself in that; and if he did, that would destroy the Argument and prove that the Law had the Promise of the Life to come. And the Meaning only can be, that Religion should be every Man's chief Concern since the good Man, who maketh it such, is sure thereby of the Favour of God here and hereafter. But

St. Paul says * *that if in this Life only we have Hope in Christ, we are of all Men most miserable* (a), and these Words are brought to prove that Christians have no Hope in Christ in this Life; when, that they have, is so plainly asserted in the Words themselves, *if in this Life only*, which implies certainly they expect-

* P. 469. l. 5.

(a) 1 Cor. xv. 19.

ed some Favours from Christ here, though what they expected here was not sufficient *alone* to balance the Troubles the Profession of Christianity called them to; and what the Apostle says, that the *Knave* hath the Advantage of the *honest* Man in this Life, is true enough; at least it was so at that time of Day, when Christianity was under Persecution. Next,

The † Apostle calls “ *the Jewish Religion* a (a) carnal Commandment,” Mr. Warburton by marking out *carnal Commandment* in large Letters, seems to lay a great Stress upon the Expression, which he says, must mean a *Law promising carnal Things or the Things of this Life*. No! the Apostle means by it a *Law which stood in Meats and Drinks and divers Washings and carnal Rites or Ceremonies* as he describes the Law, Heb. ix. 10. and applies *carnal* to the Rites or Ceremonies, which might be, and were *Shadows of good Things to come*. What Shifts and Turns are here!—are these *positive Observations*? do such Things as these *expressly assure us* that *temporal Rewards* were the *Sanction* of the *Jewish Dispensation*? He goes on,

* “ As to the Sanction of a future State
“ of Reward and Punishment, not being in
“ the *Mosaic Dispensation* St. Paul says—(b)
“ *Death reigned from Adam to Moses, and from*
“ *Moses to Christ*—Now I ask how the A-
“ postle could possibly say that Death reigned

† P. 470.

(b) Rom. v. 12.

(a) Heb. vii. 15.

* P. 470.

“ under

“ under the *Mosaic* Dispensation, if that People had the Knowledge of immortal Life to be procured by a *Redeemer to come*, any more than it can be said to reign now?” This is his Argument, to which I answer.— By *Death's* reigning, is meant Men's dying and lying in the Bands of Death; which is Death's reigning over them, for so long as they are his Prisoners he reigns over them. Christ broke the Bands of Death for himself and many others at his Resurrection, which was triumphing over Death and leading Captivity Captive: Now because Death reigned over all Men till Christ conquered him by his own Resurrection, doth it follow that Men did not know that Death was to be conquered? I hardly think it possible that this can be the Gentleman's Meaning, the Reasoning is so excessively weak, and the Consequence so wide of the Premisses. And yet I think verily, I don't mistake him, I would not willingly do so; if he means this, is it any Argument that *Adam* did not know that Christ was to conquer Death, because he could not conquer it himself? Just such another childish Mistake he makes of “ (a) *Christ's abolishing Death, and bringing Life and Immortality to Light through the Gospel,*” as if it might not be known before-hand that Christ was to abolish Death, because he *did* abolish it. Or, as * if *bringing Life and Immortality to Light*

(a) 2 Tim. i. 10.

* P. 471.

was the same with teaching Men they *were to be brought to Light*. That bringing Life and Immortality to Light doth not signify *teaching the Doctrine* I have Mr. Warburton's own Authority to prove, because he says it became a *popular Doctrine among the Jewish People* about the time of the *Maccabees*. And that the *Prophets* taught it, then according to himself, the Gospel did not bring the Doctrine to Light, or teach it first; I question whether he will like this Authority, or that any body else will take it—but it is plain the Words mean that Christ through his own Death abolished Death, and by his Resurrection gave *Demonstration* of his Conquest; which was bringing Life and Immortality to Light; thus *Moses* might teach the *Doctrine* as well as the *Prophets*, and yet Christ bring *Life* to Light. And *Scripture will be consistent*, though this Gentleman's System is *not*.

Bringing Life and Immortality to Light, is usually understood to mean, bringing the Doctrine to Knowledge; but it cannot mean so, because the Doctrine was always known among *Jews and Gentiles*; and the Promise that Believers should enter into Happiness was preached through all Ages, *to us as well as to them*. Saith St. Paul were the good Tidings *preached (a)*, we translate it *Gospel*, but Gospel is any good Tidings, though the good Tidings

(a) Heb. iv. 2.

here are, a Promise of entering into Rest, eternal Rest; it is a *Rest* ver. 9. that still remaineth to the People of God.

The *manifesting the Mystery of the Gospel, which was hid from Ages and from Generations*, and the like Expressions, say no more than that *God was not manifest in the Flesh* till many Ages and Generations were past—(a) *Great is the Mystery of Godliness*, says St. Paul, *God was manifest in the Flesh*, &c.

The Mystery was hid, till God had taken Flesh. And when he took Flesh *the Mystery was manifested*. But this doth not prove that Men did not know the Mystery was to be manifested. I may know the Plot of a Play before it is *acted*; so I may know the subject Matter of a Mystery, before it is manifested, as I do what the *Actors* will say, before they come upon the *Stage*. *Manifesting a Mystery* is not teaching the Subject-Matter of it, but putting it into Execution. *Behold I shew you a Mystery*, says St. Paul, *we shall not all sleep, but we shall all be changed*. It was no Mystery or unknown Doctrine, at that time of Day, surely, that the Dead were to be raised, and yet he calls it a *Mystery*; and it is a Mystery that will not be *manifested* till the last Day: And yet it will be always known till the last Day come.

One would hardly think it possible for so

(a) 1 Tim. iii. 16.

great a Man as his * Book, and a Letter in the History of the Works of the Learned for *March* 1741. inform us the Author of the *Divine Legation* is, to mistake such plain obvious Passages of Scripture, and argue so childishly from them—But we have more in the same Strain—† he cites (a) *The Law made nothing perfect, but the bringing in of a better Hope did*, as if Men for this Reason *did not know* the Law made nothing perfect, and that a better Hope *was to be* brought in. Set aside Faith, and the Law was only Meats, Drinks, Washings and the Blood of Brutes, poor sorry *Hopes* for them to rest upon. He argues—*that could not be said to be* brought in, *which was there before*.—The *Things hoped for* were not in the Law, but a *Knowledge* that there were Things to be hoped for, which were not there, might be and was given by the Law. If *bringing in* signifies no more than giving them Hopes or teaching the Doctrine, of a future State, it will follow from his Argument, that barely teaching Men there was a future State, made them *perfect* and entitled them to Heaven; for he says this was what the Law wanted, *the Doctrine of a future State*, and that for this Reason the Law was *imperfect*. He can't distinguish betwixt *having Hope*, and the *bringing in*, confirming or giving, what was hoped for. What the Law wanted was not the Do-

* See the Preface to the 2d Part, *et al.*

(a) Heb. vii. 19.

† P. 472.

Strine, but the *Power* of giving *eternal Life*; and because it could not *give Life*, our Author argues it did not lead them to the Knowledge of him who could. *St. Paul* says it did, and gives this very Argument for it, *If there had been a Law which could have given Life, verily Righteousness should have been by the Law—wherefore the Law was our School-master to bring us into Christ*. How it was to bring them unto Christ, appears from its having a *Shadow*, a *Figure*, an *Example*, a *Picture* of the good things to come, though it had not *εἰκονα* the very Image of the things, which is a strong Argument to prove they knew it had no more than the Shadows. The offering up of *Isaac* by *Abraham*, had been *εἰκων* the very Image of the Sacrifice of Christ; but the offering up the *Ram* afterwards was but *σνία* a Shadow. This Argument *St. Paul* (a) urges against the *Jews* of his time, and it may be still used for the same Purpose, to prove that the Law, by its Form and Constitution, shewed it had not the Power of taking away Sin; and yet at the same time it taught them *Sin was to be taken away*. This is *St. Paul's* Argument; but that “by *Shadow*” was meant such a *typical* Representation, “so faintly delineated as not to be perceived by the People,” is a Conclusion of the Author's own; and why he should think the Body of the People so very silly as not to be

(a) Heb. x. 1.

able to see through a *Shadow*, I cannot imagine a *Shadow* supposes a Substance, by whose Interposition it is made ; and if the *Law* was a *Shadow* to the *Jews*, they must know it bore a Relation to a Substance, and what that *Substance* was it bore the Relation to, was to have been known by comparing one with the other. As they who lived before Christ came, were to learn, from the *given Similitudes*, what the Messiah was to do for them ; so they who lived when he made his Appearance, were to examine his Pretensions by the *Marks* and *Signs*, the *Shadows* and *Figures* which the Scriptures had given of him. I am so unhappy as to dissent from this Gentleman in almost every thing he advances upon the Scriptures, and many times his Arguments prove the *very Reverse* of what he brings them to prove. For Instance, “ A thousand Arguments may be “ raised from his Omission of a future State, “ to prove *Moses* really the Author of the “ Book of *Genesis*,” p. 452 ; whereas had he omitted it, it would have been one as good as a thousand to prove that he was neither the Author of *that*, nor of the rest of the Books of the *Pentateuch*, since he had not then wrote of Christ, so as every body might see *him* there, as Christ says he hath ; and the Conformity betwixt the Doctrine of *Moses* and *Christ*, the *Law* and *Gospel*, the *Old* and *New Testament* ; the *Types* and *Antitype* are as strong a retrospective Evidence for *Moses* as could be given ;

given; indeed makes the two Testaments mutual Supports of each other,—So again, *that one illustrious Evidence of the Dependency between the two Religions had been wanting, if the Jews under the Law had known the Law could not give Life*, seems to me to be true, for the very contrary of the Reason given here, and that such Evidence had been wanting, if they *had not known* it—because the Argument from the *Law*, that a more excellent Sacrifice was necessary to *atone for Sin*, had been entirely lost, had they not had sufficient Reason to look on their *Law* as a *Shadow*, *Type*, *υποδειγμα*, or *Exemplar* of something farther to come. To what Purpose could Christ have appealed to their *Law* for Evidence of himself, if they had not understood that its Design was to teach them the Way to eternal Happiness? How easy was it to have answered, “Our Fathers were taught by our *Lawgiver* himself, and by our *Prophets*, “not to look beyond the present Time, or “think of another World, much less to think “that Sacrifice was a Figure of an human “Sacrifice, who was to die and rise again, “ascend into Heaven, and be seated at the “Right-hand of God, as the first Fruits of “them that sleep.” Christ refers them to *Moses*, (a) bids them search his Writings—*Had ye believed Moses, ye would have believed*

(a) John v. 45.

me, for he wrote of me; if ye believe not his Writings, how shall ye believe my Words? This is not saying, "*Moses wrote of me in so obscure a Manner, as not to be understood. The Prophets have explained his spiritual Meaning, and disenvveloped his Sense,* go to them; but I don't mean the Prophets that lived before or during your Captivity, for they were ignorant of this Doctrine; nay many of them expressly deny it; but the two or three who lived afterwards, they have taught you the *Law* was spiritual, go to them for Evidence of me." But Christ says, "Go to *Moses*, he wrote of me, if ye do not believe what he hath *wrote*, how shall ye believe what I *say*? What Evidence can I give you, so plain as his Writings." Had not *Moses* wrote plain enough to be understood, the Fault of the *Jews* in rejecting Christ had been *his*, and not *theirs*. Had the Holy Ghost flung the Truths of God under a *Shade* and *delineated them too faintly* for the People to understand them, with what Justice could they have been condemned for not seeing them? Christ says *Moses* would accuse them to God, for not receiving him upon his Authority; but they would have had too much Reason to accuse him to God, had he left it to others to disenvelope his *Law* for them. Mr. *Warburton*, p. 452, says *Moses* kept this *Doctrine* with *studious Care* out of their Sight, for *Ends truly*
worthy

worthy of Divine Wisdom. Christ says he wrote of him, and condemns them for not receiving him upon the Authority of *Moses*. Here is a wide Difference betwixt our *Lord* and this *Christian Divine*. St. Paul says the *Law* had only the *Shadow*, and not the *very Image* of what was to come, which is an Argument not to trust to it—Mr. *Warburton* argues, that for this very Reason they did and were to trust to it for the Space of two thousand Years, without supposing it to have any Reference to the very Design for which he allows God gave it them.

The old Mistake in not distinguishing betwixt the *Law's* teaching the *Doctrine*, and giving a Title to *eternal Happiness* by its own Virtue, hath produced one Text * more from the *Hebrews*, (a) *Christ the Mediator of a better Covenant, which was established upon better Promises*; and this is brought to prove that the *Law* taught not the *Doctrine of a future State*. So because *Christ* was the *Substance*, the *Law* was not known to be the *Shadow*; but I am tired with such *Reasoning*, and beg Leave to say in my Turn, that I am ashamed of a Task which affords no better Objections to dispute upon. Whether our Objector be serious I know not; but it is high time he was.

I know of but one *Doctrine of a future State*, and but one Way to Heaven†. The

* p. 473. l. 10—21. (a) Chap. viii. 6, 7. † See p. 474.

Doctrine had never been known but for Revelation; thence it came first to Mankind, and if any Persons had imperfect Notions of it, it was owing to their having but an imperfect Knowledge of the Revelation. That the Soul survives the Body could be known from Revelation only, it is invisible to us, and the State it goes to—*Its returning to God who gave it*, implies it doth exist when separated from the Body; but *how*, or in what Condition, we are not told, that I recollect. As for the *interesting* Speculations on this Subject, I desire none, but what are deduced from Scripture.

We now come to Book the Sixth, Page 476. The Author “seems to think it hard, that after such *convincing Evidence* produced in Confirmation of his Thesis, he must be stopt to make a *tedious Answer* to a Number of Texts brought not by a few *fanciful Allegorists*, or *superstitious Bigots*, but by many *sober Men*.” — I guess who he means by *fanciful Allegorists*; and *superstitious Bigots*; I suppose the same he calls *English Cocceians*, the *Followers of Hutchinson*, who possess’d, he says, *with the low dull Madness of picking Mysteries out of Letters*, have been only able to extract the *crude Nonsense of the Cabala* to I can’t tell what kind of *Quintessence*.

This Method of calling Names, and abusing the Person of our Adversaries in general *Scurrilities*, is what Disputants are too apt to fall into; but it is so unbecoming the Gentleman,

man, and so contrary to the Spirit of Christianity, that I am sorry the World has an Encouragement to it in the Practice of this great Man. If a Parcel of contemptible, low, mean, dirty Scriblers, as all Mr. Warburton's Adversaries are, have broke through the Rules which People of Note commonly do, and Christians ought to, set themselves, it is pity a Man of his eminent Character should follow their Example. The Importance of this learned Gentleman in the Republick of Letters, and his superior Abilities of Mind, should have made him contemn the despicable Creatures, and have passed them by in Silence, or returned them an Answer in the Spirit of Christian Meekness, as a second Locke, or another Chillingworth would have done. Whatever Excuse there may be for returning ill Language, as the Poet excused himself, *responsum non dictum*; yet what Excuse is there for abusing the Dead, and a Number of Men, who have given him no Provocation at all? If Mr. Warburton can shew any thing of that low dull Madness, or crude cabalistical Nonsense in Mr. Hutchinson's Writings, let him do by them as I have done by his own, pick out some material Position, and expose it so effectually, as to point out the Madness of it plain enough for the World to see, without being told that the Author is either out of his Senses, or never had any. He may then say
he

he has an Excuse for his Censure; but he will still want one for giving bad Language.

If one were disposed to be merry, what Mirth would his great Argument afford one, that *because Moses taught not a future State, his Religion must be preparative to that of Jesus, which did* *. *East and West* are not farther asunder than the two Parts of this Argument, and I dare say six Books more will never shew the Connexion. The Error it is founded on is seen in a Moment, viz. that there is a Difference between the *Doctrine* and the *Gift* of Life. The Law taught Men that *eternal Redemption* was to be purchased for them; but it did not *give* them *eternal Redemption*. Now if he will state his Argument thus: “ The Law of *Moses* gave not eternal Life, “ therefore his Religion must be preparative “ to that of *Jesus* which did.”—And in consequence of this will prove to the *Jews*, that the *Law* taught, but could not *give*, Life, it may be of some Service to them, and he will have the *Law, Prophets, Gospels* and *Epistles* to help him out — But that the Law taught not the Doctrine of a future State, will never be proved; and every Attempt towards it will be but a fresh Instance of the Ignorance of the Undertaker, and of the careless Manner he must read both Old and New Testament in.

* p. 478. l. 8.

This it is which makes him charge the *Christian Church* and *Jews* with the same Error.

—*But the Error is not confined to the Christian Church; the Jews too maintain it with equal Obstinacy, but not with equal Indiscretion.*

The Indiscretion is *his*, not the *Church's*, in not distinguishing betwixt what is so often done, by the Apostles and the Christian Church, in their Disputes with the *Jews*, that *knowing* there was a future State, and a *Title* to Happiness in it, are quite different things. The *Jews* say *Salvation is by the Law*; but no *Christian* ever said so yet. What the *Christian Church* says is, that the *Law* had the *Shadows* of Christ, of his Actions, and of the Benefits he was to *obtain* for Mankind—and that Believers under the *Law* knew it—which last is a Point of that Consequence, that she hath levelled one of her *Articles* against *those who feign that they looked only for transitory Promises*; and as she hath expressed herself to the same Purpose too fully to be easily misunderstood, in the Homily, Part 2d. on *Faith*, *This is the Christian Faith, which these holy Men (of whom St. Paul speaks, in the xith Chap. of the Hebrews) had, and we also ought to have; and although they were not named Christian Men, yet was it a Christian Faith that they had; for they looked for all the Benefits of God the Father, through the Merits of his Son Jesu Christ, as we do now, and in Effect they and we be all one.* This is maintaining the Error, if it be

one, with great *Obstinacy*; but it is something *indiscreet* in this Son of the Church, to call it *Indiscretion*. Mr. *Romaine*, in his Sermon on this Subject before the University of *Oxford*, cited these Words, * and more to the same Purpose, out of the *Homily*; which Mr. *Warburton* takes no Notice of.—St. *Paul*, in the xith Chapter of *Hebrews*, begins with *Abel* and ends with the *Prophets*, and so shews there was but one common *Faith* from the first to the last; and it would have been a very hard Matter to have reconciled the *Homily* to his *Thesis*. The *Article* is cited indeed, and an Attempt made several Ways to get rid of it †. He begins,

—*The Law had certainly a spiritual Meaning to be understood, when the Fulness of Time should come.*

So it had a *Meaning* without a *Meaning* for two thousand Years; for if it was not understood, where was its *Meaning*? — *In the Interim, the Mystery of the Gospel was occasionally revealed to God's chosen Servants, the Leaders and Fathers of the Jewish People.*

He brings in *David*, *Solomon*, *Isaiab*, *Hezekiah* and *Jeremiah*, who were *Leaders* of the *Jewish People*, *chosen Servants* of God, all of them *Prophets*, and three of them *Patriarchs*; he brings these great Men as *positive Witnesses* against the *Doctrine*, denying directly there

* p. 38.

† p. 587.

was to be any such thing as a *Resurrection*; and yet says he doth not contradict the *Article* that *the old Fathers looked for more than transitory Promises*; but he contradicts himself and the *Article* too.

— *And the Dawning of it gradually revealed to the People by the Prophets.*

Who were the Prophets that gradually revealed it? *Abraham, Isaac, Jacob, Moses, Joshua, Samuel, David, Nathan, Solomon, Elijah, Elisha, Isaiah, Jeremiah and Ezekiel*, with many others, not only did not explain it to their Contemporaries, but did not know it themselves; most of them, and even as low down as *Jeremiah*, which brings it to the Captivity, instead of dawning out the *Revelation* to the People, deny there was any such thing as a future State. Nay, what is very remarkable, though he pretends the *Doctrine* was revealed to make Amends for the extraordinary Providence of God, which had now forsaken them, even *Jeremiah* teaches them the very contrary under their Captivity; for the *Distresses* of *Jeremiah*, as well as the *Distresses* of the *Psalmist* are appealed to, to shew that the *Church*, at that time of Day, *had the same Language throughout, and in every Circumstance of Life* *. Never was any poor Man more unhappy in his *Proofs* and *Apologies*; the one prove the Reverse of what he brings them for;

* P. 467. l. 10.

the other sap the very Foundation of his whole Building. But he says,

—*All which is exactly agreeable to what our excellent Church, in its seventh Article, teaches concerning this Matter. Cites the seventh Article.*

The Old Testament is not contrary to the New; for both in the Old and New Testament everlasting Life is offered to Mankind by Christ, who is the only Mediator between God and Man; wherefore they are not to be heard, which feign, that the old Fathers did look only for transitory Promises.

And then spends two Pages in commenting upon its Sense, as if there was any Obscurity in it.

What the Design of it was, is plain enough in all Reason.—It was to assert the Scripture Doctrine of *Justification through Faith in Christ*; and because it is said in the *Old Testament*, that the Blood of the Sacrifice atoned for Sin, and —(a) *Ye shall keep my Statutes and my Judgments, which if a Man do, he shall live in them* —They say, *the Old Testament is not contrary to the New; for both in the Old and New Testament everlasting Life is offered to Mankind by Christ.* So that the *Article* explains itself what it relates to—namely that the *Old Testament* is not contrary to the *New* in the Doctrine of *Justification*; and what he says, that it is the *Manichean Error* it was directed a-

(a) Lev. xviii. 5.

gainst, is as little to the Sense of the *Article* as it would have been to his Purpose, had it been so—But *

That the Church meant not by these Words, that everlasting Life was offered to Mankind in the Old Testament in the same Manner it is offered by the New, is evident from, &c. says our Author.

This is granting all we contend for, that the *Article* doth say, everlasting Life was offered to Mankind by Christ in the Old Testament. Whether it be offered in the *same Manner* or no, is nothing to the Purpose. His own Argument allows it was offered in *some*, though he thinks not in the *same, Manner*.

I hope it was in some *intelligible Manner*, or else the *Offer* might as well never been made. Next, Mr. Warburton thinks that

The Inference drawn from the Proposition concerning eternal Life—wherefore they are not to be heard, which feign, that the old Fathers did look only for transitory Promises is of some Service to him, and that was the Sense in Question the true, then the Inference had been, that all the Israelites did look for more than transitory Promises. He doth not understand the Article, or he would not talk so; for if the Article had said that all did look for more than transitory Promises, it would have asserted a very great Falshood, because we read of Un-

* P. 588. l. 14.

believers even as old as *Enoch*, and of many under the *Law*, who neither believed a future State, nor thought about Religion, but only to persuade others to disbelieve it. The *Article* says everlasting Life was offered to *Mankind*, not to a few select Persons here and there one, but to *Mankind*, by Christ the only Mediator between God and Man—It says *Mankind*, which is more than *all the Israelites*, had the offer of everlasting Life made them by Christ, in the old Testament, and I have shewn they had from *Adam* downwards, which *Hope* was never confined to one People. The *Jews* were preserved to continue down the Line of Christ (as it is expressed in a beautiful Allusion to the light *Jehovah* being to shine in an *earthen Vessel*) to keep a Lamp burning to *Jehovah*. Thus, all had the *Offer*, though many refused to accept it, and our Church hath worded the *Article* with great Caution and Accuracy. Nothing could be more accurate and just than the change of the Phrase, *Mankind* when she speaks of the *Offer*, and *Fathers* when she speaks of those who accepted the *Offer*, for such those who have gone before us in the Faith of Christ have been always called. And I beg leave to say, in the Words of our Church, but with the utmost Submission to Authority, that it is incumbent on those who are placed in Authority, particularly the Heads of the Church in the spiritual Capacity, *not to hear those who say, the old Fathers looked only for transitory*

transitory Promises, but by all proper Ways discourage a Doctrine of that pernicious Consequence, and those who teach or promote it, lest like good old *Eli*, they bring the Sin of their Sons on themselves.

I have not St. *Austin* by me, but by the Position in the *Citation* from him, which the Council of *Diospolis* condemned as one of the old *Pelagian* Heresies, *Quod Lex sic mittat ad Regnum [Cælorum] quemadmodum et Evangelium* seems to be meant no more than what the Scripture often says—That the Law could not give Life, as the Gospel doth; by the Law meaning the legal Atonement, by the Gospel the Atonement of Christ. And then the Law could not give Life by its Atonement; as the Gospel doth by the Atonement of Christ: Or in other Words, that *Salvation* is to be ascribed to Faith; which is no Proof that they were not, but an unanswerable Argument that they were, taught to believe in Christ, because without Faith it is impossible to please God.

Mr. *Warburton* hath one Fetch more to get clear of the *Article*, which makes the same Concession to us, as the rest have done.

— * *Whatever Meaning the Church had in these Words, it cannot at all affect our Proposition that a future State was not taught by the Law of Moses, because by the old Testament is ever meant both the Law and Prophets.*

Then the Offer of eternal Life was made, both

* P. 589. l. 10.

by the Law—and Prophets, which is all we contend for ; and what the *Article* was brought to prove, viz. that the *Law* did teach eternal Life through Christ, and Mr. Warburton hath proved it himself, by endeavouring to *disprove* it. What he adds,

—Now I own the Prophets gave strong Intimations of the everlasting Life offered to Mankind by Jesus Christ,

Will not help him out in the least, because by the *Law* must be meant the *Law*, and not the *Prophets*; the *Article* says both the *Law* and the *Prophets* gave something more than Intimations, even an *Offer of Life* through Christ. The Prophets therefore giving Intimations, will not prove the *Law* did not teach it, in the Sense of the *Article*, which was what he undertook to shew.

It may not be unseasonable, to cite, in this Place, three or four Texts, which do not seem to have had their due Weight with him, nor indeed with some others — “ He (a) “ spake by the Mouth of his holy Prophets, “ which have been since the World began ; faith “ the Father of the Baptist, That we should be “ saved from our Enemies.” And St. Peter, “ (b) Those Things which God before had shewed “ by the Mouth of all his Prophets, that Christ “ should suffer” — And again — “ Whom the “ Heavens must receive untill the Times of Re-

(a) Luk. i. 60.

(b) Acts iii. 18—24.

“stitution of all Things, which God hath spoken
 “by the Mouth of all his holy Prophets, since
 “the World began”—yea, and all the Prophets
 “from Samuel and those that follow after, as
 “many as have spoken, have likewise foretold
 “of these Days.” I shall put a Question or two
 here,—Doth not calling a Person a Prophet,
 suppose he knew Man was to be saved through
 Christ?—Doth not saying, — *all the Prophets*
that have been since the World began imply that
 there hath *always* been Prophets from Time to
 Time?—Doth not saying that they all fore-
 told that Christ should suffer, and enter into
 Glory, imply that Mankind was sufficiently
 apprized whom to place their Hopes on?—
 and that they did not rest on their Types?—
 How *chimerical* then is it to say that the People
 had no *Idea* or *Notion* of the Doctrine of a future
 State—That it was studiously kept out of their
 Sight--That there were many wise Ends of Provi-
 dence in doing so--That it would have indisposed
 them for continuing under the œconomy of
 Types and so on--Doth the Man who can talk in
 this Manner *understand* the Bible—nay doth he
believe it? But to return to *Section I. p. 479.*
 The State of the Case as given by him in this
 Page will be of no Service to him—His de-
 clared Purpose was to prove that *the Doctrine*
of a future State was not to be found in nor did
make part of the Mosaic œconomy, and that

* P. 446. l. 16.

in Consequence of this *Omission* the *People* had not the Doctrine of a future State for many Ages: Now the Soul's surviving the Body implies another State, in which it must either be happy or miserable. But I contend for more, that the *Resurrection* of the Body was known and believed, which is done by shewing that the *Covenant of Grace* was known and believed: And if People knew what the Types aimed at, which I have shewn they did, such Texts as shew the essential Doctrines of Christianity were *shadowed* out under the Rites are not *impertinent*, but fully *pertinent* to the Point in Dispute. But there are also clear, plain, express Declarations of their Faith in Christ. The Gentleman asks, * *if a future State of Rewards and Punishments was taught to the People under the Law, what Occasion for any typical Representation?* I answer, to describe *Him* who was to purchase the *eternal Redemption* for them, and the *Means* by which he was to do it, and so fix in the strongest Manner on their Minds, the *great Truth* on which their Salvation depended. A *Type* neither supposeth throwing a Thing into a *Shade*, nor *secreting* it from *vulgar* Knowledge; but is bringing it down to the most *common* Capacity, by giving them an external visible Medium by which to ascend to the Thing signified; and supposing the *Law* given for the Sake of the *Types*, is

* P. 480.

every jot as silly as supposing a Book to be wrote for the Sake of making the *Letters*, and it is not *the one or two forgotten, dirty Scriblers*, but this *great and good Man* who is supporting *convict Impertinences*. I shall however follow him in a Consideration of such Texts as he thinks proper to object to. The Text out of *Job* I have spoke to already. The seventy learned Pages to make a *Comedy* of the Story of *Job*, I shall recommend to Dr. Grey's Consideration, and they may save the Dr. some Trouble. I have nothing to do with them, and shall pass them by, and go on to p. 553, where we meet with the Annotations on *the Image of God in Man—The Breath of Life and living Soul*, which I have endeavoured to vindicate before—* The Expressions *He died, and was gathered to his People* are not worth contending for; and I do not know who hath used them for any thing more than Hints—
 “going down into the Grave speaks of the Body—
 “dy—but *falling asleep*,” “*slept with their Fathers*” is comparing Death to Sleep, and if the Bodies of the Dead are to awake as the Body, after Sleep, doth, then there is a Comparison, and the Expressions are figurative: And if this Comparison be just and true, it is also beautiful; if not the Expressions are silly and ridiculous. But I shall neither take up my own nor the Reader's Time about them.

* P. 555.

The Supposition here, *that the Objectors may mean that the Sanction of temporal Rewards and Punishments was no more than a mere Representation, in figurative Expressions, of the Doctrine of a future State*, shews that the Objections have quite confounded him; they never say any such thing, nor any thing like it. They say, with the Apostle, that the *Law* had a Shadow of the *good Things* to come: But this is not saying it was a meer Representation, in *figurative Expressions*, but a Representation in *figurative Things*; as for instance, *Ægypt* was a State of Bondage—*Pharaoh* an apostate, tyrant Prince—The *Jews* the People or Church of God—*Moses* a Deliverer, a Prophet, a Lawgiver—The *Wilderness* a State of Trial or Probation, where they wandered without any settled Habitation—Fed with Bread from Heaven—Refreshed with Water from a Rock—*Canaan* the Country they sought after—A Place of a settled Habitation to them, a Land of *Rest*—A Land flowing with Milk and Honey, all the Delights and Pleasures of Life,—where they reaped the Fruits of other Men's Labours, and dwelt in Houses they built not—Faith and Obedience to their Leader the Conditions of their Entry into it, into which Unbelievers were not permitted to enter—and which they made themselves Masters of under *Joshua* a Saviour—Now is saying the Scripture points out these

*Things as Parallels of their and our spiritual Condition—Slaves to Death and Satan, in the Bondage of Sin, delivered by Christ,—fed with the Bread of Life—refreshed with the Waters of Comfort that flow from the spiritual Rock—in a State of Probation—bid to call nothing our own, to look on ourselves as unsettled, and from our proper Homes—seeking after a Place of eternal Rest, an everlasting Settlement, where we are to have Pleasures which pass the Heart of Man to conceive—where we are to reap the Harvest of Fields we did not sow, and dwell in Mansions we did not build, Faith and Obedience to our Saviour, the Conditions and Title of our Inheritance—is saying that Scripture draws such Pictures, and that it designed Men should understand them, the same, or any thing like saying, that their temporal Rewards and Punishments were a meer Representation in figurative Expressions? Let him keep his * vile and impious Imagination, his Mahometan Allegorical Madnes to himself, and learn to give good Words.*

What the *Jews* were to understand by the extraordinary Proceedings of Providence with them in the Series of Mercies and Judgments they were tried with, before their Possession of *Canaan*, is told them often enough in the Book of *Deuteronomy*—Among other Places, Chap. viii. 2. *Thou shalt remember all the Way which*

* P. 557.

the Lord thy God led thee these forty Years in the Wilderness to humble thee, and prove thee, to know what was in thine Heart—that he might make thee know that Man doth not live by Bread only, but upon כל מוצא פי יהוה. Whatever these last Words imply, it is enough for my Purpose, that they were taught that Man doth not live by Bread only. This is further explained ver. 14—16. Which brought thee forth out of the Land of Ægypt, from the House of Bondage, who led thee through that great and terrible Wilderness—Who brought thee forth Water out of the Rock of Flint; who fed thee in the Wilderness with Manna, which thy Fathers knew not, that it might humble thee, and that he might prove thee, to do thee good באתך יתך in thy future Condition, on that Account, for that is the Purport of the Preposition ב.

That by † the Law's being typical or spiritual, is meant no more than that the temporal Rewards and Punishments really distributed to the Jews—and the religious Ritual by which the Worship of God was there performed, were typical or significative of the Gospel Dispensation, is either false or very inaccurately expressed; for first the peculiar Providence over them in Canaan so long as they kept to the Worship of the true God, was an Earnest, a Pledge of eternal Happiness, in the Land of eternal Rest; and was known by them to be such. The Ritual

by which God was there worshipped contained Descriptions in *Actions* (" a Mode of Information very common, it seems, and well understood by those who were Actors in it.") of Christ and what he was to do when on Earth, and of the Benefits he was to purchase for them, and concerned *them* in the *spiritual* Sense, as much as they did any body else. The *spiritual* Part of the entire Dispensation, as far as concerns the Happiness of another World, is future still to all but Christ and those that rose with him. The *Life* and *Immortality* is not yet made good to those that sleep in the Grave, though in *Fact* we have a clearer Evidence that it will be made good, in seeing Christ the real Priest in Heaven on the Throne of God, exhibiting his own Blood or pleading his Death and Sufferings to the real Face of God, than was given the *Jews* in seeing the Priest go into the typical Heaven and exhibit typical Blood to the typical Faces of God. Though the latter left no doubt that God would pardon Sin, and admit them into Heaven—The difference in point of Evidence is no more than what there is betwixt a Debt secured, and the actual Payment of it; though if the Debtor be *honest* and *responsible*, we call it as good as Money in Hand. This is the Case with the *Jew* and *Christian*. But that a *Jew* was a Type of a *Christian*, their *Church* of our *Church*, their *Priests* of the *Priests* among us, and so on, is a very great Mistake. Their
Priests

Priests acted in the Name of Christ, so do ours. The *Bread* in the Tabernacle—The *Manna*—The parts of the Sacrifice which were eaten by the People—The Light by the Oil in the Candlestick, which illumined the Tabernacle, and many other Particulars were *Figures* of spiritual Blessings to *them* as well as to *us*; and what *we* enjoy of them in this Life, was enjoyed by *them* also.—

But the Objectors say, “ *The Jews were a carnal People, incapable of spiritual Things* ”—Shame on those Objectors who say it. Had it been wrong, he should have confuted it, instead of that, he espouseth it * and says, that supposing the *spiritual* Sense to go along with the *literal* is contrary to *Reason*, to *Scripture*, to the *Order of Things*—which is so strangely absurd, that it takes away the very Ground and Reason of two Senses. For why, let me ask, had the Law a spiritual Sense under a carnal Cover, but for this, that the first Jews were so grossly minded as to be incapable of spiritual Things—The Jews then were a carnal People—are not all People carnal, or made of Flesh and Blood!—*incapable of spiritual Things*, why so! Were not their natural Abilities as good as ours, their Souls and Bodies made of the same Materials! Had they not an Oracle and Prophets, so God and inspired Men to instruct them! Might not the Jews have Faith, because the Object of their Faith was typified by

* P. 559. l. 7—14.

Beasts,

Beasts, and his Sufferings by slaying, shedding their Blood, and burning them? Christ was at a Distance, so the Wrath he had engaged to undergo, and all the Circumstances of it, were on many Accounts to be represented continually till he came. The external Action or literal Sense was necessary, because they had *Bodies*; and Faith and an Insight into the spiritual Sense necessary, because they had *Souls* which only can be sanctified by Faith, Hope and Charity. Therefore it is not contrary to the *Order of Things*, but necessary to the Nature of Man, that there should be a Type, because the Eye of the Soul sees only through the Eye of the Body; and agreeable to the Nature of the Soul, that there should be *Faith*, because as the Prophet says (a) *the Just live by Faith*, and God requires the Heart and the Affections.

—“ *But it takes away the very Ground and Reason of two Senses, for if they were always capable of this spiritual Sense, what occasion for a carnal one?*”

The Ground and Reason of the *Types* was not that Mankind were incapable of looking beyond a *Type*; but among other Reasons, because it was necessary the Church should have some external Actions expressive of their Faith in him who was then at a Distance, and whose Merits and Sufferings were the Ground of their Hopes as much as they ought to be now. And

(a) Hab. ii. 4.

the Types which were instituted before Writing, were infinitely more expressive, and made a much more lasting Impression on the Mind than any written Description whatever could have done. Have we not *Types* now, Water in Baptism, and Bread and Wine in the Lord's Supper? What great Capacity is required to know that these are *Types* and to look beyond them? Did not Christ intend (to use our *Author's* Phrase) that the *spiritual* Sense should go along with the *literal*? When he took Bread, and said, *this is my Body—Wine, this is my Blood*? Did he not intend that with the Eye of Faith they should see through the external Elements! or did he think they had not Capacity enough to do so? So the *first Jews* might, and till the contrary is shewn by better Arguments than I have seen yet, I shall think did, in their Sacrifices, see the great Sacrifice of *their* Lord and Redeemer; and by performing the one expressed their Faith in, and Hopes of the other; and gave ocular Proofs, that they did so, by observing those Rites and Ceremonies, which are so lively a Picture of the Original.

It looks at first Sight a very odd Notion, that the Intent of the Law should never be known till it was repealed: And when you examine it, it is full of as many shocking Consequences as any one Position I ever saw laid down. It sets the two Testaments at a Variance and makes almost every Page of *one* contradict the *other*. What is to be come of those Men who
died

died under the Law!—Goodness may, (it may be said) give Men more Happiness than was promised—but Justice will not permit a greater Degree of Misery to be inflicted than was threatened—did it become the Judge of all the World to put Men upon a Trial they did not know the Consequence of! to punish *eternally* for the Breach of a Law temporal Punishment *only* was threatned to: It may be an agreeable Surprise to the Good to find God better than his Word. They died like Beasts, and *wake* like Angels; that is paying them more than was promised, for their Integrity—St. Paul calls *the Hope that entreth within the Vail, an Anchor of the Soul both sure and stedfast*, it will still then be a Sort of Reflection on the Goodness of God, who deprived them of this Anchor of the Soul during the Storms of this troublesome Life, but it carries a severe Reflection upon the Goodness, and Justice too, of God to suppose he should inflict the Consequence of a *Sanction* he never forewarned Men of. With what Justice might the Sinner plead, in Arrest of Judgment—Lord thou threatnest temporal Punishments *only*, and told me I should suffer no more; I have paid the Penalty, I died in my Sin. My Life was to be the Forfeiture, it was taken from me; thou hast that which is thy own, what further Demands canst thou have upon me?

It destroys the Foundation of Morality, which is the *Hope* of the Rewards in another Life.

Life. Nothing can effectually influence the Mind, but the Hopes of Happiness. The revealed Will of God is the *Rule* by which we are to direct our Thoughts and Actions: And the *Reward* is the Motive which induceth us to submit to it. This is the constant Language of Scripture, which represents the good Men always acting upon this Prospect, and directs them *to look at Jesus the Author and Finisher of our Faith, who for the Joy that was set before him, endured the Cross, despising the Shame.* And he that talks of any moral Obligation, or any moral Rule, arising from the *eternal Reason of Things*—The *Fitness of Things*—a *moral Sense*, or such Jargon, talks against *Experience, Common Sense* and *Scripture*. And saying the *Will of God* is the Foundation of moral Obligation, is confused and indeterminate. If the *Will* of Man be *free*, nothing can *bind* or *compel* it; Rewards and Punishments may persuade, induce, or deter Men; that which influences the Mind to Action, is the Hope of receiving a Reward. This is the Motive the good Men of old, and the Man Christ, acted upon; and this is the Motive which we are to act upon.

But to proceed to Mr. *Warburton's* Consideration of the particular Texts urged in Support of our Opinion.—* God says to *Abraham*—“(a) I am thy exceeding great Reward”—

* P. 559, 560, 561.

(a) Gen. xv. 1.

And again—" (a) I will raise up my *Purifier*
 " between me and thee, and thy Seed after
 " thee, in their Generations, for an everlasting
 " *Purifier*; to be אלהים unto thee, and to
 " thy Seed after thee. And I will give unto thee,
 " and to thy Seed after thee, all the Land
 " wherein thou art a Stranger, all the Land of
 " *Canaan*, for their everlasting Possession, and
 " I will be their אלהים, God."

The Question now is, whether this Promise to *Abraham* and his Children contain in it any thing farther than the temporal Promise of the Land of *Canaan*? — We say yes, a Promise of the Land of *eternal Rest*; and so says the New Testament—that *Canaan* was the *Rest* of God; see *Hebrews*, Chap. iii. Ver. 18, to the 12th Verse of the next Chapter, and Chap. xi. ver. 13, &c. And Mr. *Warburton* allows it in a *spiritual Sense*—" My Christian Objectors—must be content at last to find a future State only in the spiritual Sense of these Words; and that Sense we are willing to allow them*. And that is all we want; for no Man in his Senses ever talked of a *spiritual* thing in a *carnal* Sense. It is allowed then that the earthly *Canaan* was a *Figure*, a *Type* of the *spiritual* *Canaan*; and then the Promise of the one implied the Promise of the other. It was promised as an (b) *Earnest* of our *Inheritance*, until the *Redemption* of the purchased

(a) xvii. 7. * P. 562. l. 2. (b) Eph. i. 14.

Possession ; that is, God designed it as such. And the next Question is, whether *Abraham* and his Posterity knew it ! — I say yes ; and it might be gathered from the Circumstances of the Promise — though I begin to be of the Mind, that it is *Impertinence* in the highest Degree to think or imagine that the Patriarchs and their Families did not understand what God designed should have a *spiritual* Sense ; — However the Circumstances of the Story shew they did or might know that it had also a *spiritual* Sense. In the first Place — the Promise was to *Abraham*, as well as to his Seed after him — *I will give unto thee, and to thy Seed after thee* ; which shews the Promise implied some Possession *personally* to *Abraham* ; and notwithstanding what Mr. Warburton says, we are warranted in this Conclusion by St. Stephen, “ *And he gave him no Inheritance in it, no not so much as to set his Foot on* ; yet he promised that he would give it him for a Possession, which marks out this Circumstance in a very particular Manner to our Observation. St. Stephen adds,

— *And to his Seed after him, when as yet he had no Child.*

Which is pointing out, as I apprehend, another Circumstance that shews the *earthly Canaan* was promised and given, though in Reality, but as an *Earnest* of the heavenly one, — viz. that the Promise was to all the Heirs of the Faith of *Abraham*, not to his *natural*
Seed

Seed—and so says the Text, Ver. 5.—(a) *Look now towards Heaven, and tell the Stars—so shall thy Seed be.* And—(b) *thou shalt be a Father of many Nations*—St. Paul urges this Argument,—(c) *to the End the Promise might be sure to all the Seed; not to that only which is of the Law, but to that also which is of the Faith of Abraham, who is the Father of us all, as it is written, I have made thee a Father of many Nations.*—Now it was not written for his Sake alone, &c. “ Thus we see, that both
 “ what God meant by the Promise of giving
 “ to *Abraham* and to his Posterity, and what
 “ *Abraham* understood he meant, was, that
 “ his Posterity, after a certain time, should
 “ be put in Possession of the Land, as an
 “ Earnest and Pledge of the Land of *Rest*,
 “ which both he, and all his Children by
 “ Faith, should after a certain time be for
 “ ever possess’d of; and lest any Mistake should
 “ remain concerning the Accomplishment of
 “ this Promise, the sacred Historian sums up
 “ the Relation in these Words: In that same
 “ Day the Lord כרת ברית cut off a *Purifier*
 “ (a Type of him whose being cut off entitles
 “ us to Heaven) with *Abraham*, saying, *Unto*
 “ *thy Seed have I given this Land.*” Thus,
 since *Canaan* was promised as a *Land of Rest* to
Abraham, who had no *Rest* in it, and to
 many Nations (Multitudes of Nations) who

(a) Gen. xv.

(b) xvii. 4.

(c) Rom. iv. 16—23.

never set Foot in it, we conclude, that they who saw these Circumstances of the Promise to *Abraham* knew that the earthly *Canaan* was not the *Land of Rest*, was not the Blessing, which all the Nations of the Earth were to receive from *Abraham*.

There is one Circumstance more which ought not to be passed over, namely, that the Land of *Canaam* was *promised* and *given*, to prove *Jehovah* to be אלהים, *God*, to *Abraham* and to his *Seed*; and we find great Stress laid upon this Word in the *Law* — and scarce any thing of Consequence is commanded, but the Observance of it is enforced upon this Consideration—*I am God, I am your God, I am the God of your Fathers*; and once remarkably, the whole *Law* was written, that they might fear (a) *that glorious and fearful Name Jehovah their Elahim*. From whence it appears, that something very great was implied in that Name—of *Mercy* to the *Good*, and *Terror* to the *Wicked*. Now it is well known that *Hebrew Names* are *significative*, and were usually given for some particular *Reason*. And (b) “ *in looking over the radical Words of the Hebrew Language one finds the Root Elah to mean an Oath, or Adjuration, the Execration made to affect the Breaker of a Covenant; and the Genius of the Language certainly admits the Word Elah to be used, from that,*

(a) Deut. xviii. 58. (b) Some Thoughts on Religion, &c. p. 117.

“ to signify a Person that hath taken upon him
 “ this Oath, and (with the Addition of the
 “ plural Termination *im*) Elahim to denote
 “ more Persons become subject to it, or entering
 “ into Covenant, or Agreement together.”

That a Name of God should be formed from this Root, to signify *Persons under the Obligation of an Oath*, will appear extremely just and beautiful to any one who considers the ancient Reason of imposing Names, and at the same time will recollect that noble Passage of St. Paul's—That (a) God willing more abundantly to shew unto the Heirs of Promise the Immutability of his Counsel, confirmed it by an Oath; that by two immutable things, in which it was impossible for God to lie, we might have a strong Consolation, who have fled for Refuge to lay hold upon the Hope set before us. This glorious and fearful Name, the Lord our Elahim, carries in it both Glory and Terror, infinite Mercy and Condescension, sure and certain Hopes, strong Consolation, to those who flee to Christ for Refuge, to the Heirs of the Promise—but a fearful Looking for of Indignation to those who despise the Oath of God.

The Reader will be beforehand with me, I don't doubt, in applying the Sense of this glorious Name to those frequent Admonitions, to remember that *Jehovah* is *Elahim*; and see, at first Sight, the Importance of the Sanction on

(a) Heb. vi. 17.

which the *Laws* of God in the Old Testament are so often *enforced*—*I am Elahim*. The Interest of this Tie upon their Minds, he sees, was no less than that of eternal Happiness. And instead of *transitory Promises* they had the Hopes of eternal Life confirmed to them by the Oath of God. And now our Consequence from the Land of *Canaan* being promised to *Abraham* by *Jehovah* to be *God*, (*Elahim*) unto him, and his Seed, makes itself.—*I will give unto thee, and to thy Seed after thee, the Land wherein thou art a Stranger, all the Land of Canaan, and I will be their God; in the Original*—וְהָיִיתִי לָהֶם לֵאלֹהִים, so become *Elahim* unto them. So prove or shew them, I am *Elahim*, under an Oath to bless them for ever.

There is one Circumstance more which I shall take Notice of—The Patriarchs being *Strangers* and *Pilgrims* in the Earth, and calling themselves such, is a Proof they *desired a better Country, that is, an heavenly one*. That they did so, saith Mr. Warburton, “ *is unquestionable; * but that these Words, in their literal* “ *and most obvious Meaning, express any such* “ *thing, can never be allowed.*

One would think he designed to turn the Apostle's Words upon him, and traverse what he said in his own Phrase. St. Paul says, that by those Words they *declared plainly (a)*, what they sought after; Mr. Warburton says,

• P. 562. l. 17.

(a) Heb. xi. 14.

it was not the most obvious Meaning of their Words: I think a *plain Meaning* and an *obvious Meaning* are the same thing; and if their *plain Meaning* was that they looked on themselves as *Strangers* from their proper Home, then it was *literally* their Meaning also.

—“ The pious Ejaculation of * *Jacob*—
 “ *I have waited for thy Salvation, O Lord,*
 “ may, for ought I know, saith Mr. *Warbur-*
 “ *burton*, in its literal Meaning, respect the
 “ Salvation of Christ. But how should an
 “ early *Jewish* Reader understand it in this
 “ Sense; when the same Terms of *the Salva-*
 “ *tion of God* are perpetually employ'd, through-
 “ out the whole Bible, to signify God's tem-
 “ poral Mercies to the *Jewish* People?”

The Word *יְשׁוּעָה* *Salvation* hath but one Meaning in all the Dictionaries I can meet with, *viz. Deliverance from Dangers*—and may as well be used to express *Deliverance* from the Enemies of the Soul, or spiritual Dangers, as from those of the Body; and is used in its literal Sense, in one Case as well as the other. The Context must determine which is spoke of, or the general Tendency of the Passage it occurs in, must lead us to the Intention. If he means that the Sense of the Word is uncertain, because it is often used to *Deliverance* from external Dangers, he is so far from being in the right of it, that, for this very Rea-

* P. 563. l. 7.

son, it is *not* uncertain, because the external Action fixes the Idea of the Word. And so it is with all the other Words in the Tongue. The Ideas in them are gather'd from Things which relate (if I may so speak) to the *outer Man*, which makes them intelligible when applied to the *inner Man*.

The Salvation of the Lord is to be sure a general Expression, and by itself may not determine, whether it is the Salvation of the Soul or Body which is spoke of. But *Jacob's* Design was to tell his Children what should befall them in *their (a) last Days*; and, as is the usual Method of Scripture in speaking of typical *Persons* and *Things*, refers to Christ in almost every Sentence.

If his * Commentators have led him into such an egregious Error, as that *Salvation* signifies an *hundred different things*, they are very much to blame, and I would advise him to change them for a better Set.

So again *Balaam's Wish*, *Let (b) me die the Death of the Righteous, and let my אחרית future State, or Condition be like his*, must be construed by the Tendency of the Place it occurs in. The Spirit of a Writer or Speaker is to be considered, together with the Rules of Grammar. *אחרית* for Instance, is a *future State or Condition*; but the Word doth not of itself mean the future State of another Life;

(a) Gen. xlix. 1. * P. 563, l. 20. (b) Numb. xxiii. 10.

yet when he says, *Let me die the Death of the Righteous, and let my future Condition be like his*; it looks so much like talking of his future Condition after Death, that if he had a Mind to have done it, I don't see what better Words he could have made use of — What is it which the Death and future Condition or *latter End*, if you will, of a good Man is to be preferred to that of the wicked for, but on Account of what comes after Death? — *Balaam* knew that Christ was at the Bottom of all God's Proceeding with the People of *Israel*, and has spoke of Christ in almost as plain Words as any of them have done; but his being a *Prophet* implies he knew Christ was to redeem the World, nay that he foretold it, because *St. Peter* says all the *Prophets* spake of it; and the Words may very well be allow'd to stand in their obvious and literal Sense. Pride and Ambition made an *Apostate* of him afterwards; but now he saw the Glory of Christ, and wishes to be Partaker of it.

— * *Had the Apostate Prophet said, let me live the Life of the Righteous, it would have had a much fairer Claim, says Mr. Warburton, for such a Meaning.*

I think quite otherwise, and that if he had meant what *Mr. Warburton* makes him, he must then have said, *let me live the Life of the Righteous, because a long and flourishing*

* P. 563. l. 26.

Life, the Gentleman tells us, a Line or two afterwards, is the *Reward of the righteous Observers of the Law*; and if he had wish'd to live such a Life, he would have said so. He would have talked of their *Life*, not of their *Death*, which is a most uncomfortable Closure of the Prospect to a Man who has no Hopes afterwards. Sure it must be a wrong Taste in a *Critick*, to make a Man, in his expressing his ardent Wishes for Happiness, describe it by the only Circumstance which carries any thing disagreeable in it, and that a Circumstance of so very disagreeable a Nature as Death is to a Man who hath no farther Views. But if the Glories of Christ (the Subject of his Tongue) had filled his Mind with Raptures, how natural was it for him to wish to be where the Scene opened, in Death; the Gate of Death being the Gate of Glory. Mr. *Warburton's* is certainly the most ill-judg'd Piece of *Criticism* which could fall from the Pen of so correct a Writer.

We come next to the Sixteenth * *Psalms*, which contains an *express, literal, predictive* Description of Christ's Resurrection, or no Part of the Bible doth; nay, no Words could, if those made use of here, do not. Some Prophecies may have what we call a *double Sense*; but this had not, nor could. No Body, but that of Christ's, ever died, and was raised to Life eter-

nal without seeing *Corruption*. When it *seemingly* made for his Purpose, he could find out that נַפֶּשׁ was the *Body*; but here takes no Notice of it. The Scope of the whole *Psalms* is to implore the Protection of God, from this Consideration, that he; (*David, the Beloved one*) had performed all Righteousness—That *Jehovah* is his Portion; he does not say the Land of *Canaan*—That his Lot was to be among נְעִימִים (those who give Happiness, from נָעַם Mar. Gratus, jucundus, amænus). — then an Assertion that he had always trusted in *Jehovah*—after that the Words in Question—
 “Thou wilt not leave my Body in the Grave,
 “nor suffer thy Holy One to see Corruption;
 “thou wilt make me know the Path of *Lives*.
 “Thy Presence is Fulness of Joy; the Pleasures of thy Right-hand are for evermore.”
 St. *Peter* applies several Parts of this Psalm,—in a spiritual or secondary Sense? No, in the literal obvious Meaning of the Words; and his Reasoning upon them shews they were never designed to be taken in any other Sense. And till this Author can, by the *Rules* of the Languages, parallel Expressions applied to temporal Blessings, or any other Way, fairly disprove it, I hope the Authority of the *Apostle* will weigh with the Christian Reader. It was the Force of the Words, and not the Authority of the *Apostle*, that convinced three thousand *Jews* at once. *Acts* iii. When a Man is at the Point of Death; or, in the utmost Danger

ger of his Life; to restore him to Health; or save him out of that Danger; may be called saving him from Death, or delivering him from Death; and is strictly true in the literal Expression, not in a metaphorical or figurative Sense; and means preventing his dying, which is saving him from Death and from the Grave; but that such Expressions are used figuratively or metaphorically for temporal Blessings in general, is not true that I know of—and to (a) talk of *the figurative Ideas of Death and Resurrection being used for temporal Distresses, and Deliverance*, is mistaking the Intent of Words. If the *Jews* in their Captivity called themselves *dry Bones*, a dead Body, and God by *Converse in Action* told a Prophet to assure them that *their dead Body* should come to Life, is this making a metaphorical Use of *Death* and *Resurrection*? It was making a metaphorical Use indeed of *Body* for the Community; and then all is literal afterwards—The Body was at the Point of Death, nay *dead*, as a Society, for their Power and Authority was taken from them. Restoring the *dead Body* to *Life*, is no Metaphor, will never justify a Critic in making Metaphors of such Parts of Scripture as speak of restoring Life to a Body that was dead and not in the Grave; much less of such Parts of Scripture, as speak of restoring Life to a *Body* before it should be corrupted. *And*

(a) Div. L. Part II. p. 549, 50, 51, 52.

I agree

I agree it is very fit we should understand Names agreeably to the Nature of the subject Matter; and not regulate the Truth of things on the abusive Signification of Words.

Again, As for me, I will behold thy Face in Righteousness; I shall be satisfied, when I awake with thy Likeness.

“ These Words, * says Mr. Warburton, the best Interpreters agree, do signify his morning Adorations before the *Ark*, the *symbolic Residence* of the divine Presence.”

I am very glad he will allow the *Ark* had a *Symbol* of the divine Presence—then what was done to the *Symbol* could not be more than *symbolic*, as the *Presence* it was done to was.

But, poor Man, he forgets the *Ark* stood in the Holy of Holies, which it was Death for any Man to go into but the Priest. And he only went in once a Year. *Jehovah* destroyed above seventy (a) thousand at one Time, for taking the *Vail* off the *Ark* and *Cherubim* and looking in upon them. And his best Interpreters have deceived him. The King never stood in *Præsentia Dei ad Arcam*, not even once a Year, much less, *quotidie*.

† And again,—*I will dwell in the House of the Lord for ever.* By which Mr. Warburton says is only meant dwelling in the *Tabernacle* (the *Temple* was not then built) *to Length of Days.*

* P. 564. l. 13. (a) 1 Sam. vi. 19. † P. 565. l. 1.

The Holy of Holies, we have shewn, was the *Figure* of Heaven, and the *Tabernacle* of the *Holy One*, the outer Court was this World; which of these was it, *David* desired to live in? If in the first, then he desired to be in Heaven; if in the second, it was desiring to be in Christ. If in the last, it was indeed desiring to be in this World to a Length of Days. But if *David* knew there was a future State, as our Lord himself, St. *Peter* and St. *Paul*, and his Words in many Places, say he did, which was is it most likely for him to long for? I put this Question, on Supposition that *David* is speaking of himself; and pass on to another Passage out of the *Psalms*,

† *With thee is the Fountain of Life: in thy Light we shall see Light.* This Text is allowed to teach the *Eternity* of God, but not the eternal Happiness of Man.

It is true that the *created Light* is God's, but it is plainly the *eternal Light*, in whom we are to see Life and Happiness, which is spoke of here.—*With Jehovah is the Fountain of Lives, and in his Light we shall see Light*, what less can be meant than seeing Life and Happiness in the *Light Jehovah*? This was the Form of Blessing when the High Priest returned from the Holy of Holies. *Jehovah make his Face to shine upon thee, &c.* In the Gospel—(a) *in him was Life, and the Life was the Light of*

† P. 565. l. 9.

(a) John i. 4.

Men,—And, *I am the Light of the World* are not disputed; and why should the like Expressions in other inspired Writings, on the same Subject? *Life* throughout the Scriptures is Happiness, and *Death* Misery, when speaking of another World. And this shews the Weakness of his Inference from his next Citation, *Pf. xlix. ver. 15. Like Sheep shall they lay in the Grave, Death shall feed upon them*, which he says, means *, *that the Wicked shall be untimely cut off*. If the Prophet had meant so, he might easily have said it—but he adds, to explain his Meaning—*They shall never see Light*, which, if it were spoken of the Light of this World, would be saying, they should never be born. He says nothing about the Length or Shortness of their Life, only that they should continue under the Power of Death, and should never *see Light* more, but that the *Elahim* should rescue his Body out of the Hand of the Grave, and that *Jehovah* should *take him*. † And here, once for all, let me Desire the *Objector* to observe that, (as *Death* was what *Adam* incurred by his Sin, and which cut him off from eternal Happiness,) delivering from Death, restoring to Life, and many other Phrases of the same Import, is taking off that Curse and restoring to the Happiness which he had forfeited, for one implies the other necessarily. And as the Happiness of good Men is

* Lin. 23.

† Lin. 28.

expressed by restoring to Life, so the Punishment of the Wicked is with the same Propriety described by laying under the Power of *Death*, and consequently still under the *Curse*. And therefore it is not *Misery* and *Torments* which should be opposed to *Life* and *Redemption*, but *Death* and *Imprisonment* in the Grave in the many Passages of this Sort.

* *Thou (a) shalt guide me with thy Counsel, and afterwards receive me to Glory.* This Mr. Warburton paraphrases—*thou shalt be always present with me in Difficulties and Distresses; and shalt lead and conduct me to better Fortune.*

But still the Question may be put, whether he was to enjoy that better Fortune in this World, or the next. I say in the next. *Being received into Glory*, is a very strong Expression, and *being received into Heaven, entering into Glory*, and the like, are the Phrases used in the New Testament to describe the Completion of what is here predicted—and the Context points out this Sense—The *Psalmist* or Inditer of this *Pf.* was a good Man, and as such must have had (*as the Law always gave that Reward to the Observers of it*) a long and prosperous Life; but he complains, *all the Day long have I been plagued and chastened every Morning*; therefore he must speak of some other good Man, who was to be a *Man of Sorrows, and acquainted with Grief*, whose Enemies were to

* P. 566. l. 4.

(a) *Pf.* lxxiii. 24.

triumph over him unto Death, who was to be raised from thence and afterwards received into Glory—and who could say, (ver. 35.) *whom have I in Heaven but thee? and there is none upon Earth I desire in Comparison of thee.* The good Man himself *expected* and *received* his Reward here, and therefore could not speak of himself, but of another who did neither *expect* nor *receive* his Reward here. *This literal Sense the Context again requires.*

As *Life* is Happiness, Length of Days, &c. is Length of Happiness, and therefore *The Mercy of the Lord is from everlasting to everlasting upon them that fear him and his Righteousness unto Children's Children*, is no Proof that it is temporal Happiness, [which doth not, nor ever did under the *Law*, last to any thing which may be called *Length of Days*,] that is spoke of under such Phrases. The Scriptures throughout, and particularly the *Psalms*, complain of the Shortness of Life, as in this *Psal*m ver. 14. *He knoweth our Frame, he remembereth that we are Dust: As for Man his Days are as Grass: As a Flower of the Field, so he flourishes, for the Wind passeth over it, and it is gone.* Then follow the Words in Dispute, *But the Mercy of the Lord is from Everlasting to Everlasting*, making the Opposition as plain as Words can, betwixt Happiness here and hereafter—the one only for a short Space, the other for Days without Number, for many Days, to a Length of Days, *from Everlasting to Everlasting.*

lasting. Whoever is the Speaker here, his Body was to bless God for forgiving its Iniquities ver. 3. and healing all its Infirmities, and redeeming from *Corruption* its Life, and *renewing its Youth like the Eagles*, ver. 5. and so on, in a Stile not very easily to be mistaken.---Ps. cxxxiii. * *There the Lord commanded the Blessing, even Life for evermore*—Nothing can be meant, says our Objector, *but that Death and Dangers should not approach a House so strongly united within itself.* Whatever is meant by this *Psalm*, that could not be meant, that *Death* should not approach the House, because all Men are to die.

I am not so full in answering these Objections made to Passages out of the *Psalms* as I should have been, had not a Dissertation on them in *The Use of Reason, &c. Part 2.* made it unnecessary; and say no more than just to obviate the Exceptions.

—Proverbs xiv. 32.—*The wicked is driven away in his Wickedness: But the Righteous hath Hope in his Death.* That is, says our Objector, *the Righteous hath Hope he shall be delivered from the most imminent Danger.* No, this Interpretation won't do. At least he hath not proved it yet by the Places he refers to, viz. —Ps. xxxiii. 19. *to deliver from Death their Body, and to revive them in the Famine*—and lvi. 13. *on me thy Vows, O God, I will render*

* P. 566. l. 21.

Praises unto thee, for thou deliverest my Body from Death. For they both relate to the *Resurrection*, the first to that of the *Upright*, when their Bodies will be rescued from the Hand of Death, and (a) the *hungry filled with good Things*. The other to his *Resurrection*, on whom were the *Vows* of God. And construe these Passages *literally*, “ having Hope “ in Death,” “ delivering from Death,” “ re- “ deeming from the Grave,” and they must refer where we refer them, had not these Expressions been intended *literally*, it would not have been called *delivering* from Death, but *deferring* Death. *Imminent Danger* is never called Death; and yet delivering a Man out of imminent Danger is saving him from Death; but that is not calling the Danger, Death; saving him from the Danger is *by Consequence* saving from Death; And what are we to say in Answer to the Man who confines all the *figurative* Expressions to the *literal* Sense, and turns all the *literal* Expressions into *figurative* Ones?

That the *Wicked being driven away in his Wickedness* means their being punished here, with shortness of Life, or any other Ways, I must deny. This World is not the Place of Retribution, but the next. And *Solomon*, as well as all the rest of the inspired Writers, often tell us so.

(a) Luk. i. 53.

N

“ (a) All

“ (a) All this I considered in my Heart,
 “ even to declare all this, that the Righteous
 “ and the Wise, and their Works are in the
 “ Hand of God, (of the *Elahim*) no Man
 “ knoweth either Love or Hatred, by all that
 “ is before him. *All Things come alike to all,*
 “ *there is one event to the Righteous and to the*
 “ *Wicked; to the good, and to the clean, and*
 “ *to the unclean; to him that sacrificeth and*
 “ *to him that sacrificeth not. As the Good,*
 “ *so is the Sinner, and he that sweareth as he*
 “ *that feareth an Oath.*” This looketh as if
Solomon knew nothing of temporal Rewards
 being the Sanction of his Religion, or that
Wickedness was always to be punished in this
 World. The Conclusion of this Book shews
 he referred the reconciling this mysterious Pro-
 ceeding of Providence with the Sons of Men,
 just where the New Testament doth, to a
 Judgment to come—for *God shall bring every*
Work into Judgment, with every secret Thing,
whether it be good, or whether it be evil. So
 little Reason hath the Gentleman to argue as
 he doth.

He brings some other Places from the Book
 of *Proverbs* which he says relate to this Life,
 and so they may, if those we have already con-
 sidered, do—and he brings one, which shews
 plainly what the Scripture means, by prolong-
 ing the Days of the Life of the Righteous,

(a) Eccles. ix. 1.

namely, that it is extending the short Span to beyond Death. “ * *Though a Sinner do Evil an hundred Times, and his Days be prolonged —good shall not be to the wicked, neither shall he prolong the Days.*” Could the Prophet say in the same Breath, that though he *prolong his Days*, yet he should not *prolong the Days*, if two different Things were not spoke of ?

These are all the Passages of Moment, that I meet with, till we come to the New Testament, which may be supposed to relate to a future State that our *Objector* hath examined, by which it appears, that the *Objector* hath been *remarkably* inattentive to the three following Considerations, which ought never to have been absent from the Thoughts of an Interpreter of the Old Testament. 1. The *Context*. 2. The Genius of the *Hebrew Language*. 3. The Oeconomy under which Mankind lived, from the Fall, to Christ; namely, of *Types and Shadows*. But this last is a Fault, though the most material of all, yet common to him, and the *Jewish Writers*; who considering only the *external Figures* have thought it harsh and unnatural to interrupt them in a spiritual Sense.

On the whole therefore, it appears, that all these Passages, in their *obvious* and *primary* Sense, relate to *the Things of another Life*; but that *some of them* are expressed by the Holy

* P. 567. l. 10.

Spirit in such a manner as makes it possible for them to have likewise an *inferior* and *carnal* Meaning, but do indeed refer to the Completion of the *Law*, and the *Gospel*.

* We come at length to the Texts of the *New Testament*, which are urged to prove, in Conformity to the *Old*, that Life and Immortality were offered to Mankind through Christ under the *Old Testament*.

1. The first is that famous Argument of our Lord's against the *Sadducees*—*Jesus answered and said unto them ye do err, not knowing the Scriptures, nor the Power of God.—But as touching the Resurrection of the Dead, have ye not read that which was spoken unto you by God, saying, I am the God of Abraham, &c. (a).* There is not throughout the whole Bible, a plain Text, as this is, more strangely mistaken and perverted by the *Objector*. 1. First he states the Argument wrong, nobody ever thought (that I recollect ever to have seen) that it tended to prove that the Bodies of the Patriarchs were *then* risen. He cites *Le Clerc* in his *Défense des Sentimens sur l'Histoire Critique*, who says, that “our Lord urges these Terms in such a manner that he supposes, qu’il ne faut qu’entendre la langue dans laquelle l’écriture, parle pour reconnoître la resurrection;” and it is very plain that our Lord does take it for granted that a Resurrection is a Consequence of

* P. 569. (a) Mat. xxii.

the Sense of the Words—*God of Abraham, &c.* But Mr. *Le Clerc* doth not say, nor any thing in the least tending that Way, (in these Words,) *that he understood them to be used by our blessed Lord as a direct Proof of the Resurrection of the dead Body; in the manner St. Paul urges the Case of Jesus himself: “ But now “ is Christ risen from the Dead, and become the “ first Fruits of them that slept :” than which nothing could have been more irrational and absurd, saith Mr. Warburton, the Bodies of Abraham and the Patriarchs being yet in Dust.*

But *Le Clerc* says what implies the very contrary in the Words Mr. *Warburton* cites from him, and distinguishes in *Italicks*; “ one need “ but read our Saviour’s Reasoning, to be convinced that it is a Consequence from this “ Expression, *To be God of any one*, that it “ cannot be applied to God, if he, of whom “ it is said, *he is God*, were dead, *Sans devoir “ jamais resusciter*, without being to be raised “ again.” Could Mr. *Warburton* mistake the Meaning after such plain Words, if he understood *French*! If he did not understand the Tongue, why did he meddle with it? And if he did, what are we to think of him?

But what hath led our *Objector* into his Mistake of the Intention of this Text, is not considering the Meaning of the Word *God* or *Ela-him*, which refers to the Covenant of Grace; being taken from that *Oath* which in a gracious Condescension to the Quiet of our Minds, in

Order to give us the most confident Assurance, *Jehovah* was pleased to engage themselves by, to perform the *Covenant*, or put in Execution the Means they had devised of redeeming Man from the Bondage to *Death*, *Sin*, and *Satan*; which at first Sight shews the Force of the Argument. “ The *Elahim*, are not *Elahim* of “ the *Dead*, but of the *Living*.” If the Bodies of the Dead are not to rise, how does *Jehovah* take off the Curse by the Fall, *that Dust thou art, and to Dust thou shalt return*, and yet God has sworn to reverse that Curse, as his Name shews?

And our Saviour in arguing with the *Saducees* tells them, *that they err, not knowing the Scriptures*; which implies, that if they had known the Scriptures, they would have believed the Resurrection of the Dead.

But Mr. *Warburton* says, * as (a) touching the *Dead that they rise*, is not an Exordium to a direct Proof, that *the Dead do rise*; what Words could have been an *Exordium* to such a Proof, if these are not?

—Whereas, says he, *the Proof that follows is only indirect, namely, an Argument, for the separate Existence of the Soul*; there is no mention, nor talk about the Soul, or any thing like it. The whole Dispute is about the Resurrection of the Body. *The same Day came unto him the Sadducees, which say there is no Resur-*

* P. 570. l. 3.

(a) Mar. xii. 26.

rection, says St. Matthew, and it is plain they thought of the *Body* and not the *Soul*, by the Difficulty they thought they had saddled the Doctrine with—*Whose Wife shall she be of the Seven?*—St. Mark, and St. Luke relate it in the same manner. St. Luke says, *Now that the Dead are (to be) raised, even Moses shewed at the Bush.* It is very evident therefore that our Lord designed to prove the Resurrection of the Dead, if his own Word may be taken—It shews however the pious Intention, though a Frailty in this good Man that was resolved to save the Veracity of Scripture at some rate or other; only it is a little too open to deny the Force of such plain Words, but as it was charitably meant, I hope it will be excused. His Zeal got the better of his Judgment. That they denied the *separate Existence of the Soul*, he hath brought no Proof, or that they thought there was any Soul; what is said of them in *Acts xxiii. 8. That the Sadducees say there is no Resurrection, neither Angel nor Spirit*, has been generally understood to signify that they believed Men had no *Souls*, if it doth not signify so, this Gentleman will shew it: but whether it doth or not, it is an entirely groundless Notion that the Reason why they did not believe the Resurrection of the Body was a Principle that *the Soul had no separate Existence, but died at the Dissolution of the Union.*

—2. * *A second Mistake is, says this Gen-*

* P. 590. l. 29.

N 4

tleman,

tleman, *that* Jesus by *these Words* insinuates,

No, we say he hath *asserted positively*, that Moses cultivated the *Doctrine of a Resurrection*.

Yes, and so says the Text, that *he shewed* that the Dead are to be raised.

—But here the *Objectors* seem to forget against whom the *Argument* is addressed, the Sadducees; now these not only held that Moses did not teach, but that he did not believe that *Doctrine*.

Be it so. That will not alter the Sense of the Words, Moses *shewed the Dead should rise*; and if Christ says *he did shew it*, that is all was contended for by Mr. Romaine: And now what Service is this *Subterfuge* to him?—They thought *Moses did not believe* a Resurrection; and Christ hath proved that *he taught the Doctrine*. The Opinion of *Moses* about a Resurrection is not in Dispute; but whether his Writings contained any Proof of it; which Christ says they do, and hath appealed to a particular Passage for Proof of it, which silenced his Adversaries, and met with the general Approbation of the By-standers. And thus much for this celebrated Text, which I could not have thought could have occasioned any Dispute; but I hope we shall hear no more of it, in the Way of Opposition.

The next *Objection* is against the Parable of the *rich Man* and *Lazarus* (a), where the for-

(a) Luke xvi. 27.

mer being in Hell, desires *Abraham* to send the latter to testify unto his Brethren, lest they also come into that Place of Torment. The Answer is, that, if they hear not *Moses* and the Prophets, neither will they be persuaded, though one rose from the Dead. This we think was to testify to them, that unless they mended their Manners, they would come into a Place of Torment; and that *Moses* and the Prophets had given them sufficient Warning on this Head; that there was a Place of Torment, and that it would be the Lot of Men who led the Life they did. Mr. *Warburton* says “ No, “ *that by a perverse Connivance* * we don’t reflect that the Parable is addressed to the “ Pharisees, the great † Patrons of a future “ State—and that it was spoke to reform their “ Avarice and Luxury.

Be it so. Might not *Dives* think it as necessary his Brethren should be reminded there was a Place of Torments, as our Lord think it necessary the *Pharisees* should be told so? We don’t suppose the five Brethren had never heard there was a future State, and the Parable supposes the *rich Man* had not been punish’d in this Life, and that his Brethren went prosperously on in their Pride and Luxury; so that if all § *that either Logic or Criticism will authorise the Believers of a future State to draw from this Parable is*, this momentous

* P. 572. l. 17. † P. 573. § P. 574. l. 10.

Truth, *that God is a severe Punisher of Luxury and Inhumanity unrepented of.* It will follow, that the *rich Man* would have sent *Lazarus* to let his Brethren know, that God would punish them in this Life, which he himself had not been, nor were they to be, who as Heirs to his Fortunes and Prosperity together, lived the same luxurious inhuman Life. And if it was not to testify to them that God would punish in this Life; if that be too absurd to suppose, then it must be to testify to them, that God would punish in another Life, and *that they might not come into that Place of Torments.* To which the Answer is—*If they hear not Moses and the Prophets, neither will they believe though one rose from the Dead.* And our Conclusion will stand good, that there is in *Moses* and the Prophets a stronger Evidence that God will punish in another World, than there would be in the Message of one from the Place of Torments. It is very evident the rich Man wanted his Brethren to be admonish'd that God would punish them in another World, however they did, or might think to, escape here. And the Answer, to be any thing pertinent to the Purpose, must mean, that *Moses* and the Prophets did sufficiently inform them God would do so. So that both Logic and Criticism authorise us to draw more from this Parable, than that God is a severe Punisher of Luxury, namely, that he is a Punisher of it in *another World.*

Which

Which justifies all the Consequences we have drawn from it.

Mr. *Warburton* seems to be sensible of it, because he flies to another Shift, which if it would have served his Turn, might have saved a Couple of Pages to confound the plainest Words.

— * *Moses and the Prophets taught a future State.* But my Proposition is, that *Moses* did not: Therefore I might well allow, that when the Prophets are joined with him, and have explained the spiritual Meaning of his Law, and disenvolved his Sense, they both together did teach it.

This is such a pitiful Evasion it hardly deserves an Answer. I hope he will oblige the World with a Comment upon *Moses* out of the *Prophets*; though I can hardly be persuaded that *Haggai*, *Zechariah* and *Malachi* should contain such clear Explications of the spiritual Meaning of the Law, while *Isaiah*, *Jeremiah*, *Ezekiel*, and all the rest of them, taught the very contrary. But doth any Body think, that when *Abraham* said *Moses and the Prophets*, he meant, *Moses explained by the Prophets*, and not the Writings of *Moses*, and the *Prophets*, as two distinct Sorts of Evidence, as the Scripture always distinguishes them—(a) *witnessed by the Law and the Prophets—persuading them both out of the Law of Moses, and out of the Prophets.*

* P. 574. l. 14.

(a) Rom. iii. 21.

* In what follows, this meek and modest Man hardly thinks his Objectors serious, as well apprized as he is of the *Gravity of their Natures*. “ (a) Search the Scriptures, for in “ them ye think ye have eternal Life.” — To which he adds, *The homicide Jews, to whom these Words are addressed, thought they had eternal Life in their Scriptures, therefore they had eternal Life.*” —

As well acquainted as I am with this Gentleman's Disposition to mistake the most obvious things, I hardly think it possible he should be innocent here; and yet Charity inclines me to lay the Fault rather upon his *Understanding* than his *Will*.

By *having eternal Life in the Books of Moses* can only be meant, that he *taught* them the Way to attain eternal Life, not that *the Writings* gave them eternal Life, and yet so this Gentleman construes it. What the *Jews* thought was, that *Moses* had *taught* them the Way to Happiness, which Christ allows he did. — “ Search the Scriptures, in them ye think “ ye have eternal Life,” evidently allowing they thought right, and urges the Argument upon them — *And they are they which testify of me*. You think right that *Moses's* Design was to point out the Way to Happiness, and *I am the Way* which he points out; and yet *ye will not come to me, that ye may have Life*. Doth it

* P. 574. l. 24.

(a) John. v. 39.

follow from hence, that because the *Jews* thought they had eternal Life in *Moses*, * *therefore the Mission of Jesus was intirely vain, as being superseded by that of Moses*? Might not *Moses* teach them eternal Life, and yet Christ give it? The Words *υμεις δοξετε* allow they thought right, and are by no Means parallel to that of St. Paul, (a) *Thou art confident* †, and so Commentators construe them; but what is more to the Purpose, the Context makes it necessary to understand them so: —“ Ye know that *Moses* taught a Way to “ Happiness, I am that Way, which he testifies of, and yet ye will not come unto me.” And the *Word* hath this Import in other Parts of Scripture: *I think also that I have the Spirit of God*, says St. Paul. It is true, a Man may *think* and *think* wrong; but the Form of our Lord’s Argument shews, he did not intend to say, “ Ye think wrong in thinking that ye “ have Life in the Scriptures.” If Mr. *Warburton* had not mistaken the Meaning of *having Life in the Scriptures*, he had never mistaken the other, *ye think*.

In § earnest what this Scripture teaches us is, *that the Jews thought Moses designed to teach them the Way to eternal Happiness*; for which, if our Lord’s Words won’t pass alone, we have the concurrent Testimony of the *Law* and *Prophets*, *Gospels* and *Epistles* to prove, not

* P. 574. l. 34. (a) Rom. ii. 19. † P. 575. l. 6. § L. 14.

only *they thought so*, but that they thought right; only were greatly mistaken in thinking the *Type* could serve them, St. Paul says, *The Promise came not by the Law*, and so says their own Scripture. St. Paul says, *If Righteousness came by Law, then was Christ dead in vain*. The Scriptures predicted (both the Law and the Prophets) *that Christ should die*, which had been in vain, if the *Type* could have given Life. St. Paul argues, that *if the Inheritance were of the Law, it was no more of Promise*; and the Scriptures shew them the *Promise* was before the *Law*, therefore the *Inheritance* was not by the *Law*—All which might have convinced them, that the *Law* was not intended to do any thing else but *teach* Life. As the Scriptures taught them the Conclusions above, Experience might have taught them another, which St. Paul makes, namely, that the *Law did not give Life*, no Body having been restored to Life by Virtue of it—no, not the Priests themselves. The Blood was to atone for *Life*; either therefore the *Sacrificer*, or the *Sacrifice*, or both, should have come to Life again, to shew that God had accepted a real Atonement, which he did, when he raised to Life the *Sacrifice* and the *Priest* in Christ. Therefore St. Paul argues, that *if there had been a Law given, which could have given Life, verily Righteousness would have been by the Law*.

Whether

Whether these Texts of Scripture tend to establish mine, or Mr. *Warburton's* Thesis, let the Reader judge. And I proceed to what he calls the * *Palladium* of the Cause, the famous *eleventh Chapter* to the *Hebrews*.

Where *St. Paul* begins with *Abel*, and ends with the *Prophets*, and shews they all had *Faith*, and one common Faith; instancing in some illustrious Character through all Ages of the Church—*That they looked for an heavenly City—that they saw the Promises afar off, and were persuaded of them—that they all died in Faith—that they made Confessions of their Hopes in another World—and that by Faith they did all their acceptable Works to God,—resisting through Faith unto Blood.* “ This, says † *Mr. Warburton*, his *Objectors* say, plainly shews, “ that a future State of Rewards and Punishments, or, more properly, the Christian “ Doctrine of *Life* and *Immortality* was taught “ by the *Law*.

No, they don't say, that it proves the *Law* taught a future State; but that it proves, the Church through all Ages had Faith in Christ—had Hopes of a Resurrection, believed in and relied on the Promises of God, and died in the same Faith. *This it proves.* Our Church, in the second Part of the Homily on *Faith*, makes this Use of the Chapter—*All these Fathers, Martyrs, and other holy Men,*

* P. 576. l. 14.

† P. 576. l. 28.

(whom

(whom St. Paul spoke of) had their Faith surely fixed in God, when all the World was against them.—They looked for all the Benefits of God the Father, through the Merits of his Son Jesu Christ, as we now do, Let Mr. Warburton reconcile this to his Thesis, and consider whether any Prophet, David or Jeremiah for Instance, could be ignorant of the Doctrine, or assert the contrary—or whether the Church in general, which was never destitute of these bright and shining Lights, can be supposed ignorant of what there was always a Cloud of Witnesses to testify. But to return. Romaine expresses himself thus, Serm. p. 30. *But those happy Effects which flowed from not taking the Ceremonies of the Law in a literal Sense, and the consequent Hopes of future Happiness, are so fully described in the xith Chapter of the Hebrews, that every Christian must believe the Patriarchs and Jews did not rest upon the temporal Promises, but were as well acquainted with a future State as we are at present. The Connection between the Knowledge of Christ and a future State is so inseparable, that we need not lose time to prove it; and that the Faith here so much insisted on, is Faith in Christ, the Definition in the first Verse fully proves; because no other can teach us the Substance of what we are to hope for, or give us Evidence of things we have not seen; and because this Faith was able to effect the Salvation of the Soul, which none but the Christian Faith can do. Neither is there Salvation in any other;*

ther; for there is none other Name under Heaven given among Men, whereby we must be saved. “ (a) The Just shall live by Faith “ —Believe to the saving of the Soul.(b)”

This is exactly agreeable to the Scriptures, and what our Church says upon the same Head; but no Mention that this Chapter was to prove that the *Law* taught a future State, but that the *Church* always had the Doctrine and the same Faith in Christ as we have, or should have now. It will follow indeed by Consequence, that the Doctrine was known under the *Law*, and that the *Law* contained nothing contrary to it. He says, that if it be asserted in this Chapter that

“ * *The Christian Doctrine of Life and Immortality was taught by the Law, then it contradicts all the rest of the Epistle.*”

How groundless his Notion is, we have already seen.

† *We may venture to say then, says he, that this eleventh Chapter must have a very different Meaning.*

He should have made some Apology for writing so directly contrary to the Church of which he is a Member. It is a very bold Venture against the *plainest Words*, and next to that of Scripture, against the *highest Authority* we can have in this World, and which he has long since subscribed to. He was shewn

(a) Acts iv. 12.

(b) Heb. x. 38.

* P. 576. l. 33.

† P. 577. 14.

this; yet instead of retracting or justifying himself, persists in it; and, as is the Nature of all who are in an Error, grows worse and worse, and advances a Doctrine, as pernicious in itself, as fatal to the Happiness of Men, as contrary to the Scriptures, and the Sense of the Church, as ever were advanced by Collins, Tindal, or any Infidel of them all. It is the dreadful Precipice that leads down to the *Gates of Death*. The Positions he lays down are, that * it was *Faith in the Abstract—the Act of believing—in God; but not the Faith in Christ, which made all the Patriarchs before the Law, and all the Rulers and Prophets under the Law acceptable to God*. And that this is what the Apostle contends for through the Epistles to the *Hebrews* and *Galatians*, viz. *That Faith in the Abstract*, and not the *specific Faith in Jesus*, was what justified the Fathers of old.

If Faith in *the Abstract* made the *Patriarchs*, the Favourites and Friends of God, so high in his Favour, why may not the same Faith justify others? What a Door is here opened to support the Cause of *Deism*? Was it for this the *Divine Legation of Moses* was to be demonstrated? To stamp the Authority of God on a *Tenet* that destroys Christianity?

This is not accidental, it unavoidably follows from his Thesis, and if, I charitably hope, he was not aware of it *at first*, it hath run him

* P. 578. l. 1—10.

into it *now*, and he has but one Step more to direct Apostacy.

I hope this will raise a suitable Horror of such Doctrines, and till the Person that hath maintained them, doth *openly* and *publickly* renounce them, and ask Pardon of God and Man for the Scandal they give, that *Christians* will look on him in a Point of View I am sorry he hath placed himself. Pray God open his Eyes, and shew him the Labyrinth he hath lost himself in.

The Sense of the *Articles* and *Homilies* on this Head is well known, that

It is not *Faith in the Abstract* which is pleasing to God; not the *mere Act of believing*, but *Faith* that worketh by Charity—and that not a Faith in God only. *This Faith*, says the Homily, (a) *by the holy Apostle St. James, is compared to the Faith of Devils, which believe God to be true and just, and tremble for fear; but the Faith which is well pleasing to God is a true Trust and Confidence of the Mercy of God through our Lord Jesus Christ.* The whole Homily is full to this Purpose; and in the second Part, which is very expresse to the Purpose in Hand—the Church says—*How plentiful this Faith is of good Works, and how it maketh the Work of one Man more acceptable to God than another, St. Paul teaches at large in the xith Chapter to the Hebrews, then runs*

(a) Part I. on Faith.

through the Particulars of the Chapter, and adds as before cited—*Although they were not named Christian Men, yet was it a Christian Faith which they had; for they looked for all the Benefits of God the Father, through the Merits of his Son Jesu Christ. This Difference is between them and us, that they looked when Christ should come, and we be in the Time when he is come.* The second Part of the Homily on Salvation asserts the same Doctrine—*Righteousness cometh to Men by Christ's Death and Merits—And St. Paul, in his Epistle to the Galatians, proveth the same.*

Thus unknown to the Scriptures, and to the Church of God, are the Notions of our Author, either that *Faith in the Abstract* ever justified,—That the Patriarchs were so justified; or that St. Paul's Design, in the Epistles to the Hebrews and Galatians, was to maintain any such Doctrine. They say, he not only asserts, but has proved the contrary in those Epistles, and cite the Fathers as agreeing with them in the same Doctrine of Faith and Justification—*This Faith the Holy Scripture teacheth us; this is the strong Rock and Foundation of the Christian Religion. This Doctrine all old and ancient Authors of Christ's Church do approve; this Doctrine advanceth and setteth forth the true Glory of Christ, and beateth down the vain Glory of Man. This, whosoever denieth, is not to be accounted for a Christian Man, nor for a setter forth of Christ's*

Christ's Glory; but for an Adversary to Christ and his Gospel. And immediately afterwards, — *We be justified freely by this lively and perfect Faith in Christ only.*

Warburton sets out wrong in his Comment on the Epistle to the *Hebrews*, “ * That “ it being directed to *Jews* and *Judaizing Christians*, the Point in Difference was “ this, the Gospel taught *Justification by Faith*, the *Judaizers* thought it needs must “ be by Works — That the Dispute was “ not whether Faith in *Moses*, or Faith in “ *Jesus*, made Men acceptable to God; but “ whether Works, or the *Act of Believing*.” I hope the Gospel taught Justification by Faith in God, and our Lord *Jesus Christ*, and that the Mercies of God are confined to us in Christ; and if this be the Gospel Faith which justifies, the Dispute must be, whether *Faith in Jesus*, or the *Works of the Law*, with Faith in God, makes Men acceptable to God.

If by *the Faith* which he says the Gospel teaches Justification by, Lin. 21. he means no more than he does by *the Faith*, which he says was the Subject of St. *Paul's* Dispute with the *Jews*, that is, if by *Faith* in one Part of his Argument he means the same he does by it in the other, *the Consequence* will be, (what I observed just now there was but one Step to) that the Gospel teaches Justification by

* P. 577. l. 18.

Faith in the *Abstract*, by the *Act of Believing*, and that Men may now be justified without Faith in Christ. But I hope he did not mean so; if he doth not, his Argumentation must stand thus,

“ The Gospel taught Justification by Faith
“ in God, through Christ.”

“ The *Jews* thought the Works of the
“ Law and believing in God would justify
“ them, — therefore,

“ The Dispute was not whether Faith in
“ *Moses*, or Faith in *Jesus*, made Men accep-
“ table to God; but whether *Works*, or the *Act*
“ of believing.”

Either this must be his Argument, or the Consequence above will hold. If this be his Argument, it can be of no Service to him where he uses it; for if the Gospel teach Justification by Faith in *Jesus*, St. Paul, in preaching the Gospel (to the *Hebrews* and *Galatians*) must contend for that *specific Faith*; proving to them that their Ancestors had been all justified by the mere *Act of Believing*, without Faith in *Jesus*, had destroyed his own Doctrine.

What St. Paul chiefly aimed at, in his Epistle to the *Hebrews*, was to prove the *Law* had the *Figures of the good things to come*, and that their Ancestors always had *Faith* in Christ; to which Purpose he runs through their History and religious *Ritual*; in his *Exordium* to which, he says, Chap. iii. Ver. 5. *Moses verily was faithful in all his House as a*
Servant,

Servant, for a Testimony of those things which were to be spoken after.

And our Gentleman hath mistaken the Ground of the Dispute which the Apostle holds, as I am afraid he hath the Nature of *Christian Faith*.

His next Mistake is, * *the Apostle's Definition of Faith* in the first Verse—which, he says, *puts the Matter out of Dispute*—The Substance of things hoped for, the Evidence of things not seen, *not of Faith in the Messiah, but of Belief in the general, and on good Grounds. Indeed very general; not only Belief of the future, but the past.*

Our Church says, *that Faith is the sure Ground and Foundation of the Benefits which we ought to look for, and trust to receive of God*; and refers to the Passage under Consideration for Proof, but never thought it excluded *Faith in the Messiah, in whom, says Scripture, and in whom only, all the Promises of God are yea, and Amen (a).* — (b) *The Promise is in Christ* — (c) *God hath given to us eternal Life, and this Life is in his Son.* The Church says, “(d) The right and true Christian Faith is, “ not only to believe that Holy Scripture, and “ all the aforesaid Articles of our Faith, are “ true; but also to have a sure Trust and Confidence in God’s merciful Promises, to be “ saved from everlasting Damnation by Christ.”

* P. 578. l. 18. (a) 2 Cor. i. 20. (b) Eph. iii. 6.
(c) 1 Joh. v. 11. (d) Homily, part III. on Salvation.

Faith therefore (as *the Substance of things hoped for*) in the Words of an inspired Writer, and in the Mouth of a Christian, must include Faith in the Messiah, because through his Merits only we are said to hope for the Mercies of God.

—The Apostle *having defined what he means by Faith*, says Mr. Warburton, *proceeds next to shew its Nature by its general Efficacy*, Ver. 6. *which very Faith he immediately illustrates by that of Noah, Abraham, Sarah, Isaac, Jacob, Joseph, and Moses.*—*The Jewish People passing the Red-Sea, encompassing the Walls of Jericho, and by the Faith of Rahab the Harlot: But was any of this Faith in Jesus the Messiah?*

I answer, yes; every Particular shewed their Faith in God through Christ: That he was to be reconciled to them by his Son *Jesus Christ*; that it was not the *Act* of Faith, but the *Object* of Faith, who was to save them, and conquer their *spiritual Enemies* for them. And this gave them a sure Confidence in the Promises of God, and a ready Obedience to all his Commands.—*Noah* inter al. believed the *Messiah* was to descend from his Loins, and therefore did not distrust the Promise that he should be saved from the general Destruction, and become *Heir of the Righteousness which is by Faith*. So of the rest; and *Rahab*, the Harlot's, is a remarkable Instance of a *Faith that Salvation should be of the Jews*. She says to the Spies, *Jehovah your Elahim, he is Elahim*

him in Heaven above, and in the Earth beneath (a). Which is saying as plain as Words can, that the Jehovah they worshipped, is only able to give Salvation in Heaven above, or in the Earth beneath; for giving Salvation is what the Word Elahim implies. And of Moses, the Apostle says, he esteemed the Reproach of Christ greater Riches than the Treasures in Ægypt; for he had Respect unto the Recompense of the Reward. What now shall we think could induce this Man to ask, if any of this was Faith in Jesus the Messiah?

But he has one Argument more.—* *Lastly, to evince it impossible that Faith in the Messiah should be meant by the Faith in this eleventh Chapter, the Apostle expressly says, that all those to whom he assigns this Faith, had not received the Promise, therefore they could not have Faith in that which was never yet proposed to them for the Object of Faith.*

The Apostle says, *they saw the Promise from afar, were persuaded of it, and embraced it, but did not live to receive it, Ver. 18 and 39.* And because they did not live to receive it, they did not know such Promise was to be received, says Mr. Warburton. A Man that could either *designedly* or *undesignedly* mistake such a plain, easy, obvious Sentence, ought never to put Pen to Paper again; his Admirers won't thank him for exposing them.

(a) Josh. ii. 11.

* P. 579. l. 22.

That

That you may be sure He thought it an Argument of great Weight, he tells you, " that it proves it *impossible* that *Faith* in the " Messiah should be meant, because the Apo- " stle *expressly* says, (and marks out in great " Characters) *they had not received the Pro- " mise*, therefore they could not have Faith " in that which was never yet proposed to " them for the Object of Faith." Mr. *War- burton*, in a Letter to Mr. * *Romaine*, makes the same egregious Blunder in construing this Text, which made Mr. R. enlarge upon it in his Sermon †, and he might have seen his Mistake corrected there; that by it was meant no more than that *they did not live to the Per- formance of the Promise*, as a Text cited from the *Acts* shews plain enough.—(a) *The Promise which was made unto the Fathers, God hath fulfilled the same unto us their Children, in that he hath raised up Jesus again.* And in another Place — (b) *Witnessing both to small and great, saying no other things than those which the Pro- phets and Moses did say should come; that Christ should suffer, and that he should be the first that should rise from the Dead, and should shew Light to the People, and to the Gentiles.* We see a Promise was made to the *Fathers* that

* Mr. *Warburton* says, *one Bate* claims a Letter he receiv'd from Mr. *Romaine*; I desire he would give his Authority for saying so, or else the *Falshood* must lie at his own Door. I am very well satisfied he cannot *know* it to be true; and question whether he doth not know it to be false.

† P. 32, 33. (a) *Acts* xiii. 32, 33. (b) xxvi. 22, 23.

God would raise up *Jesus* from the Dead, though the Fathers did not live to receive the actual Completion of it. The Apostle tells *Felix* (a), that he had *Hope* towards God, which the *Jews* also allow'd, that there should be a Resurrection of the Dead, and afterwards calls it *the Hope of Israel* (b). So there is no Reason to confine *the Promise* to a few select Favourites of God, such Promise being the general Intent of the *Types*, and the common Voice of the *Prophets*, as also the *common Faith* of *Israel*. Much less is there any Reason to say, that those who were *persuaded of the Promise*, who *saw* it at a Distance and *embraced* it, did not know there was such a Promise to be performed, because they died before it was performed.

* That the *Patriarchs* saw the *Promises* afar off, were *persuaded of them*, and *embraced them*, and *desired a better Country*, that is, an heavenly, is my *Business* to prove, says Mr. Warburton; and if I should propose to do it more effectually than these *Objectors* have ever done, I believe no body will think I pretended to any great Matters.

The Apostle hath effectually done it, or else I can easily see, it had not been so readily granted. He that could say *David*, *Solomon*, *Hezekiah*, *Jeremiah* and *Ezekiel* were Strangers to the Doctrine, would not want much

(a) Acts xxiv. 15. (b) xxviii. 20.

* P. 580. l. 8.

persuading that *Abraham, Isaac and Jacob* were so too. Especially since the Apostle, *at the same time, farther assures us, that even they had not received the Promise, though they had obtained a good Report through Faith, or believing it on reasonable Grounds.*

*Warburton adds *,—but then it is evident that the Writer of this Epistle meant that none but the Patriarchs and Leaders of the Jewish People saw these Promises afar off.*

The contrary is as evident as possible; for he instances, in *Sarah, in Rahab, and Women who received their Dead raised to Life again*; which last Particular I shall beg Leave to refer to *authentick Evidence* for Proof of; *Elijah's* raising the Widow of *Sarepta's* Son (a), and the *Shunamite's* Son raised to Life by *Elisha* (b), are plain Instances of a strong Faith. He ascribes the falling of the Walls of *Jericho* to the Faith of those who encompassed it, which takes in the whole Army—He ascribes their Passage through the *Red-Sea* to their Faith, which takes in the whole Body of the People, *Men and Women*. Mr. *Warburton* has also overlooked the thirty-second Verse of this Chapter, where *David* and the *Prophets* are said to have had *Faith*. I am afraid He did not take time enough to consider the Matter, which may *probably have abated*

(a) 1 King. xvii.

(b) 2 King. iv.

* Lin. 20.

the Vigour of his Work; it would take any Man else three times eight Years to prove such a Proposition as our Author has undertaken.

After this full Confutation of the Error which the Church of Christ hath always maintained with so much *Obstinacy* and *Indiscretion*, "that Men knew what God bid them worship him for," he may justly triumph and look down with Contempt on *the one or two forgotten dirty Scriblers*, who have presumed to assert, and endeavoured to maintain it.

*This is all I could hear of, says he, * in the way of Objection to my Opinion, and this all is such a Confirmation of it, that I am in Pain lest the Reader should think I prevaricate, and draw out the strongest Texts in the New Testament to support my Proposition, under the Name of Objections to it.*

He really has been so unhappy as to pick out of the *Old and New Testament* both, Texts enough as Proofs of his *Theses*, which *alone* entirely overturn it; and I could be content to put the Issue upon the Evidence of those very Texts. I see nothing farther that relates directly to my Subject, produced out of the Scriptures; and whether the Author of the *D. L.* hath said enough, which he seems to be well assured of at present, *to satisfy all reasonable Men in these Points*, I shall leave to their Judgment, and his farther Examination.

* P. 580. l. 30.

† P. 585. l. 8.

But to give these Arguments Credit † with those who determine only by Authority, says Mr. Warburton, I shall in the last Place support them with the Opinion of one of the most illustrious Writers the English Church ever produced, the learned Bishop Bull; and then cites some Passages from his *Harmonia Apostolica*, which convey a Meaning as opposite to the learned Bishop's real Sentiments and Intention, as those disingenuous Citations from *Job* and *Ecclesiastes* above, do from the Intention of the inspired Writers. That excellent Person, Bishop Bull, hath two *Sermons* on this Subject, and I beg Leave, before I consider the *Latin* Quotations, to produce one or two from thence, that the Reader may see the Bishop's Opinion on this Head. The Title of one is — * *Everlasting Life hoped for by good Men under the Old Testament*, p. 320. “ But the divine Psalmist more
 “ particularly takes Notice of two principal
 “ Blessings of God belonging to the Faithful,
 “ which indeed are the Matter of two great
 “ Articles of our Christian Faith, *the Forgiveness of Sins*, and *the Life everlasting*.
 “ P. 323. 1. That good Men under the Law,
 “ or Old Testament, looked beyond this present,
 “ vain, transitory Life, and believed and hoped
 “ for an everlasting Happiness in the Life to
 “ come. For such Faith and Hope you see
 “ David plainly expresseth in this Text; and

† P. 583. l. 8.

* See Sermon viii. 318. Vol. II.

“ the same he often otherwise declares in this
 “ Divine Book of the Psalms.” Proves it
 from several Passages out of the Psalms, &c.
 and p. 337. says “ By these Testimonies and
 “ Instances it sufficiently appears, that good
 “ Men under the Law *did not live and die*
 “ *like Swine*, feeding only on the Husks of
 “ these earthly Vanities, as some have foolishly
 “ imagined. They had undoubtedly a future
 “ State in their Eye, and lived by the Faith of
 “ it as well as we. This Faith was first de-
 “ rived not from the Law of *Moses*, for that
 “ in the *Letter* of it promised nothing beyond
 “ this Life; but from the gracious Revelation
 “ of God to Mankind from the Beginning.”
 —P. 343. “ This Promise was made to *Adam*
 “ in *Paradise*; this Promise was renewed to
 “ Mankind presently after the Fall; it was
 “ believed by *Adam* and his Sons; it was
 “ preach’d, publish’d, yea, and exemplify’d
 “ by *Enoch*.—This Promise continued in force
 “ under the Law, and was not made of no
 “ Effect by it.—In a Word, the Doctrine of
 “ a future Life and Judgment continued *in-*
 “ *violate and unquestioned* among the *Jews* till
 “ after their Return from the Captivity.” And
 Sermon xiv. p. 586. 1. “ That the Doctrine
 “ of the Recompence of Reward to be be-
 “ stowed on the Righteous after this Life,
 “ was understood and believed by the People
 “ of God, before the Law was given.—Such
 “ a Knowledge and Belief the divine Author
 “ assures

“ assures us *Moses* had—And whence learned
 “ he this Doctrine? We have no Ground to
 “ say, that he received it by immediate di-
 “ vine Revelation.—He had it therefore by
 “ Tradition from his religious Parents, being
 “ nursed by his own Mother, and trained up
 “ in his Father’s House till he arrived to some
 “ Years—By them he was taught the true Re-
 “ ligion, the Religion of the holy Patriarchs,
 “ and this Article as the chief Branch of it—
 “ Nor is it to be doubted, but that the same
 “ Religion, in the Substance of it, was pre-
 “ serv’d in *all other pious Families* of the *He-*
 “ *brews.*” P. 590 “ From the first Institu-
 “ tion to fallen Man, proceeded *the Law* of
 “ expiatory Sacrifice (as Types and Shadows
 “ of the great Sacrifice in due time to be of-
 “ fered by Christ, the second *Adam* for the
 “ Sin of the first) practised by the imme-
 “ diate Sons of *Adam*, and from thence de-
 “ rived into the Practice of all Mankind.”
 P. 591. “ As to those good Men who lived
 “ under the Law of *Moses* (though that in the
 “ *Letter* of it, had none but carnal and tem-
 “ poral Promises) it is *certain* they still re-
 “ tained the same Faith of a Life to come, as
 “ also their Posterity do to this Day. Nor
 “ did the Law that came after, evacuate or
 “ thrust out the *Gospel* that was delivered from
 “ the Beginning.”

Mr. *Warburton* hath *suborned* a Witness that
 overturns his own Cause; I could hardly have
 thought

thought he would have appealed to *Authorities* to justify the strange Absurdity which the Church of God through all Ages hath disowned; and which Christians of all Sorts and Denominations to this very Day agree in condemning. The very Sectaries, nay even the Quakers, join with the Church of *England* on this Head. They all say, the Law of *Moses* did not justify in the *Letter* of it, but contend, that Believers saw Christ through those Shadows, and that *Faith* made it effectual to the Purposes of Justification and Salvation; and it would have been very surprising if so eminent a Christian Bishop, as the pious Bishop *Bull*, should have thought otherwise. And I am very glad our Author's *Assurance* hath given that illustrious Body, the *University of Oxford*, an Opportunity to shew their † Disapprobation of the Espouser of so monstrous a Doctrine. We will now come to the *Latin Citations* from the *Harmonia Apostolica*. I must make a Distinction here which Mr. *Warburton* hath suppressed, but which the *Bishop* often advertises his Readers of, *Legem Veterem*, to use the *Bishop's* own Words, * *duplicem omnino χριστον habuisse, seu dupliciter spectari posse*. 1^o, Carnaliter & secundum literam, quâ instrumentum fuit πολιτείας Judaicæ. 2^{do}, Spiritualiter, quâ σκηναν ειχε των μελλοντων αγαθων. And P. 218. The

† Mr. *Warburton* lately applied to the University of *Oxford* for the Degree of Doctor of Divinity, but was refused.

* Cap. 7. Section 8. p. 106. Londini, MDCLXX.

Law Spiritualiter considerata, erat ipsissimum Evangelium; nec de ea hoc modo sumpta, controversiam hinc ullam movet Apostolus. The derogatory Things therefore which the Bishop hath said of the *Law*, it is plain are to be understood as spoken of it in its first Acceptation, *carnaliter & secundum literam*; and the Reader may easily see that very different Things ought to be said of it under these different Views. In the first Sense the *Jews* understood it in our Saviour's Time, as bearing no Relation to any thing further to come, or to Christ who was to *realise* it: And therefore the Apostles in their Disputes with the *Jews* justly treat it as *the Ministration of Death, as a carnal Ordinance, which made nothing perfect, and which was not able to purge the Conscience*; but consider it as God designed it, and they call it *holy, just and good* (a), and say, that *the Man which did these Things, should live by them* (b); and Christ says, *he came not to destroy, but fulfill it* (c). And in this they are followed by the *Bishop*, who hath sufficient Reason for saying what Mr. Warburton cites from him, but not what he would represent him as saying, viz. *Lex enim promissa * habuit terrena & terrena tantum.* Bishop Bull's Words are, *Lex enim quatenus Apostolo in suis cum Judæis Disputationibus consideratur, proprie*

(a) Rom. vii. 12.

(b) x. 5.

(c) Mat. v. 17.

* D. Leg. Part 2. p. 585.

designat

designat pactum in Sinai factum: Vide Gal. iv. ver. 24. illud autem promissa habuit terrena & terrena tantum. And so he says in his Sermons, that the Law in the *Letter* of it promised nothing beyond this Life; consider it *carnaliter & secundum literam*, and it made no promise of future Happiness. Mr. Warburton, according to his usual Method, leaves out one part of the Sentence, and tacks together two others which were not designed to stand together, and convey a Meaning very wide of this excellent Person's real Intention. The next Citation is mangled in the same wretched Manner—*Siquis contra sentiat ejus est locum dare, ubi æternæ vitæ promissio extat, quod certe impossibile est*—It is certainly impossible to shew a Promise of eternal Life to him that rests on the *Letter* of the Law, but it is easy to shew that the Jews were told so; and it follows immediately in the Harm. Apost. *Verum est quidem, terrena illa promissa, data Legi operum, Signa fuisse eorum bonorum, quo Legem Spiritus sequebantur, atque hæc sub illis, Dei ipsius intentione, fuisse comprehensa*, with more to the same Purpose; and then adds, as cited, *Verum hæc non sufficiunt ut dicamus vitam æternam in fœdere Mosaico promissam fuisse.* No certainly, *Fœdus Mosaicum* could not give Life. The Law was not designed for that Purpose. The Law considered according to the *Letter*, the meer Observance of the typical Ceremonies,

gave no such Promise; and so the Bishop explains himself in a few Lines afterwards—*deinde vita hæc eterna typis adumbrata, ac promissis generalibus comprehensa, non data fuit, ut modo innuimus, externæ isti Justitiæ in literâ Legis exactæ; sed spirituali illi puritati ac pietati, cujus altera ista externa tantum umbra fuit. Sicuti enim sub cortice bonorum temporalium latuerunt bona æterna, ita etiam religio corporalis in Lege præscripta, umbra fuit et Typus spiritualis justitiæ in Evangelio clarius revelandæ. Verbo dicam: Lex carnaliter et secundum literam spectata nec spirituales justitias exegit, nec vitam æternam promisit: spiritualiter vero considerata erat ipsissimum Evangelium; nec de ea hoc modo sumpta, controversiam hæc ullam movet Apostolus.* The Bishop next puts the Question. *An igitur, inquires, fuerunt sub Lege, qui vitam æternam sperarent? Resp. Qui meliores erant et perspicaciores in populo Judaico, verisimile est, &c.* determines it in the affirmative — and says, *immo statuendum illud omnino est—nec refert, quod hujus Fidei vix ac ne vix quidem ulla in Canonicis, V. T. Scripturis mentio fiat;* and observes they had Prophets all along who interpreted *obscura in Lege mysteria* to the People, Section 10, and Section 11. says, *hæc quidem docendi Ratio, apud populum crassior, limatior apud τὰς προνοήσας obtinuisse videtur usque ad ea Tempora, quæ Babylonicum exilium secuta sunt.* Tum

Tum vero primus omnium Daniel de Resurrectione egit apertius; quem secutus est et Ezekiel.

I have cited these two last Passages, as well to shew the Bishop's Sentiments, as to shew how little to the Purpose another Citation is, which Mr. *Warburton* hath made from him, and marks out in great Characters, as something very material—*promissa autem hæc Typica et generalia, non additâ aliunde interpretatione, pene impossibile erat, ut quis isto sensu intelligeret*, since it appears, interpretationem aliunde additam fuisse: That there were Men through all the Ages of the Church, both able and willing, and who did explain the *Types* and *general Promises* to the People.

It is a tedious Task to unravel such Chicanery, but I have submitted to it, that I might vindicate so great a Man as Bishop *Bull* from the foul Imputation laid to his Charge. It were to be wished Mr. *Warburton* would have some Regard to the Honour of the *Gown* which he now wears. Such an *indirect Practice* to carry a *Cause*, we might have expected from him heretofore, but the Clergyman, and every honest Man would scorn it. He subjoins to this Head, — *my Adversaries may now blush to see whom they have been abusing all this Time; but it will be but Charity to keep them in Countenance.*

If I knew of any thing that *ought* to keep him in Countenance, I would return the Com-

pliment and give it him. But my Advice will be of more Service to him if he will take it: which is, to pull down *the Self* that stands so high in his own Opinion, and submit to think it possible he may be mistaken, and he will be much better qualified to see whether he is or no; as well as the more disposed to treat his Opponents with good Manners, and a greater Command of Temper. *Pride of Heart deceives Men.*

F I N I S.

28 JY 58
ERRATA.

P Age 9. l. 11. for *יחמט* read *יחמט*. l. 19. for Life's, r. Lives. p. 49. l. 5. add Portrait of old Age, p. 10, 11. P. 53. l. 27. for Men, r. Man. P. 60. l. 9. add Cap. 1. ver. 1. P. 65. l. 7. for had, r. hath. P. 71. l. 19. dele it. P. 89. l. 19. after could not, add without Faith. P. 92. l. 2. r. The first Account we have of Man. P. 94. l. 19. for holy, r. Hebrew. P. 99. l. 12. for or, r. are. P. 104. l. 11. for their, r. your. P. 111. put the fifth line, after shall not come up, in lin. 4. P. 126. l. 22. for Observations, r. Assertions, and for Things, r. Texts. P. 128. l. 27. instead of the Point, put a Comma after them, P. 148. l. 16. for *אחר יתך*, *אחריהך*. P. 149. l. 12. after The insert, typical Atonement he has compleated, but the Promise of. P. 161, l. 1. after Seed, add only. P. 162. (a) for 18. r. 28. P. 168. l. 9. dele his. P. 170. l. 28. for not, r. rot. P. 179. l. 26. for interrupt, r. interpret. P. 181. l. 23. for after, r. of. P. 190. l. 3. for serve, r. save. P. 201. l. 23. r. Ver. 13. and 39.